Non-Shannon inequalities in the entropy vector approach to causal structures

Mirjam Weilenmann* and Roger Colbeck†
Department of Mathematics, University of York, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD, UK.
(Dated: October 4, 2016)

A causal structure is a relationship between observed variables that in general restricts the set of possible correlations between them. This relationship can be mediated by unobserved systems, random variables in the classical case and shared density operators in the quantum case. Entropy vectors—vectors whose components correspond to the entropies of each subset of the observed variables—are a means to differentiate between different causal structures. Non-Shannon entropic inequalities are applied in the causal setting and found to give new constraints on the possible entropy vectors in the classical case. By providing a tighter outer approximation of the set of realisable entropy vectors, they enable a sharper distinction of different causal structures. Whether these improved characterisations are also valid for the quantum case remains an open problem whose resolution would have implications for the discrimination of classical and quantum causes. This causal approach may prove useful as a way to answer the question of whether non-Shannon inequalities hold for the von Neumann entropy.

arXiv:1605.02078v2 [quant-ph] 1 Oct 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

Science is concerned with the production of theories that enable us to make useful predictions. Although the basis for doing so is observation, theories often involve concepts or mechanisms that cannot be directly observed. When there are correlations between two or more observations, we usually look for an underlying mechanism that explains them. How these correlations come about may not be apparent and there may be several competing explanations. Further experimentation with adjustments to particular parameters is one way to decide between the candidates. However, there are many situations in which it is difficult (or unethical) to perform the experiment we would like, or ones in which certain systems are outside our control. In a cryptographic scenario, for example, an adversarial agent may be able to choose certain parameters. However, the adversary usually only has a chance to influence the protocol of the honest parties at particular times. This can be modelled by restricting them to a specified causal structure.

Taking a particular causal structure generally leads to a restriction on the set of possible correlations that can be produced. A well-known example of such a constraint is a Bell inequality [1]. That such relations can be violated using measurements on quantum states motivates us to consider more general *quantum* causal structures. Correlations that can be generated in the latter but not the former are the basis for several important cryptographic tasks [2], in particular for device-independent protocols for key distribution [3–6] or the generation of private randomness [7–10].

Within a given causal structure, characterising the set of corresponding classical, quantum and post-quantum correlations provides a basis to understand further tasks and possible quantum and post-quantum advantages. The constraints on the allowed classical and quantum correlations in particular causal structures were initially studied in specific cases [11–15]. For a general causal structure, deciding whether a given set of correlations can be generated is not easy. Difficulties arise in part because the sets of correlations compatible with most causal structures are not convex, and also because enforcing that particular conditional probability distributions are equal corresponds to a set of non-linear relations on the probabilities. We follow a series of work [16–22] that uses entropy in order to simplify the characterisation of the corresponding sets of correlations. Rather than looking at the distributions themselves, we consider *entropy vectors* whose components are the joint entropies of each subset of the observed variables[1]. This has the advantage that the set of entropies realisable in a given causal structure is convex. In addition, the causal constraints can be represented by linear relations between entropies. This latter property means that entropy is often a convenient means to distinguish different causal structures.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. After reviewing the entropy vector approach in Section II we go on to study the extent to which it can distinguish classical and quantum versions of a given causal structure. In particular, we point out the role of non-Shannon inequalities in this context. It was remarked in [18] that they might be relevant for the entropic characterisation of causal structures, but, until the present work, no examples were known. We report here the first examples that show non-Shannon inequalities are useful in this context. Section III is devoted to a detailed characterisation of the triangle causal structure, one of the simplest causal structures in which there is a separation between classical

* msw518@york.ac.uk
† roger.colbeck@york.ac.uk

[1] Note that when we refer to entropy vectors, these only contain joint entropies of observed variables; we do not allow conditioning on particular outcomes—see the conclusions for further discussion.

and quantum at the level of correlations. We show that a tighter description of the set of allowed entropies in the classical case can be obtained by exploiting non-Shannon information inequalities, which extends previous results. In particular, we find numerous new entropic constraints that apply, leading to the tightest entropic characterisation known to date. Unfortunately, though, we are unable to establish whether or not these are sufficient to separate classical and quantum versions of this causal structure. We also give an inner approximation, capable of certifying that particular entropy vectors are realisable in the triangle causal structure. In Section IV, we analyse a number of other causal structures taking into account non-Shannon inequalities for their entropic characterisation. These inequalities turn out to be relevant for distinguishing different classical causal structures as well as for settling the question of whether there is a classical-quantum separation in the entropy vector approach.

II. ENTROPY VECTOR APPROACH

In this section we review the entropy vector approach for studying both classical and quantum causal structures, as well as hybrid cases, restricting our considerations to discrete variables throughout. Readers who are familiar with the topic may skip to the next section.

A. Classical entropy cone

This is defined in terms of the Shannon entropy [23].

Definition 1. *The* Shannon entropy *of a discrete random variable X taking values $x \in \mathcal{X}$ with probability mass function $\{p(x)\}_{x\in\mathcal{X}}$ is*

$$H(X) \coloneqq -\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} p(x)\log_2 p(x),$$

where $0\log_2(0)$ is to be interpreted via the limit $\lim_{p\to 0^+} p\log_2(p) = 0$. Furthermore, let X and Y be two discrete random variables with joint probability mass function $\{p(x,y)\}_{x\in\mathcal{X},y\in\mathcal{Y}}$. The conditional entropy *of X conditioned on Y is*

$$H(X|Y) \coloneqq H(XY) - H(Y). \tag{1}$$

Definition 2. *The* mutual information $I(X:Y)$ *and the* conditional mutual information $I(X:Y|Z)$ *of three random variables X, Y and Z are*

$$I(X:Y) \coloneqq H(X) + H(Y) - H(XY), \tag{2}$$
$$I(X:Y|Z) \coloneqq H(XZ) + H(YZ) - H(Z) - H(XYZ). \tag{3}$$

A further entropic quantity that will be of interest in the following is the *interaction information* [24] of three random variables X, Y and Z, defined as

$$I(X:Y:Z) \coloneqq I(X:Y) - I(X:Y|Z).$$

All of the above quantities can be expressed as linear combinations of appropriate (unconditional) entropies. For a set of $n \geq 2$ jointly distributed random variables, $\Omega \coloneqq \{X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n\}$, we denote their probability mass function as $P \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{n}}$, where $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{n}}$ is the set of all probability mass functions of n jointly distributed random variables. The Shannon entropy maps any subset of Ω to a non-negative real value:

$$\begin{aligned} H : \mathscr{P}(\Omega) &\to [0,\infty) \\ X_S &\mapsto H(X_S), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathscr{P}(\Omega)$ denotes the power set of Ω, and $H(\{\}) = 0$. The entropy of the joint distribution of the random variables Ω and of all its marginals can be expressed as components of a vector in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{2^n-1}$. We will order its components in the following as[2]

$$\begin{aligned} (H(X_1), H(X_2), \ldots, H(X_n), &H(X_1X_2), \\ &H(X_1X_3), \ldots, H(X_1X_2\ldots X_n)). \end{aligned}$$

We use $\mathbf{H}(P) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{2^n-1}$ to denote the vector corresponding to a particular distribution $P \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{n}}$. The set of all such vectors is

$$\Gamma_n^* \coloneqq \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{2^n-1} \mid \exists P \in \mathcal{P}_n \text{ s.t. } v = \mathbf{H}(P) \right\}.$$

Its closure $\overline{\Gamma_n^*}$ includes vectors v for which there exists a sequence of distributions $P_k \in \mathcal{P}_n$ such that $\mathbf{H}(P_k)$ tends to v as $k \to \infty$. It is known that $\overline{\Gamma_n^*}$ is a convex cone for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ [25]. Because $\overline{\Gamma_n^*}$ is difficult to characterise, we will in the following consider various approximations to it.

1. Outer approximation: the Shannon cone

The Shannon entropy is known to obey the following (in)equalities, collectively also called the *Shannon inequalities*[3]:

- Monotonicity: For all X_T, $X_S \subseteq \Omega$,

$$H(X_T) \leq H(X_S \cup X_T). \tag{4}$$

- Submodularity: For all X_S, $X_T \subseteq \Omega$,

$$H(X_S \cap X_T) + H(X_S \cup X_T) \leq H(X_S) + H(X_T). \tag{5}$$

The monotonicity constraints correspond to positivity of conditional entropy, $H(X_S|X_T) \geq 0$, and submodularity

[2] Since the empty set always has zero entropy, it is omitted from the entropy vector.

[3] Sometimes $H(\{\}) = 0$ is included in these, but we will take this to implicitly hold in this work.

is equivalent to the positivity of the conditional mutual information,

$$I(X_S \setminus X_T : X_T \setminus X_S | X_S \cap X_T) \geq 0.$$

The constraints (4)-(5) can all be generated from a minimal set of $n + n(n-1)2^{n-3}$ (in)equalities [26]: for the monotonicity constraints it is sufficient to consider the n constraints with $X_S = X_i$, for some $X_i \in \Omega$ and $X_S \cup X_T = \Omega$; for the submodularity constraints it is sufficient to consider those with $X_S \setminus X_T = X_i$ and $X_T \setminus X_S = X_j$ with $i < j$ and where $X_U := X_S \cap X_T$ is any subset of Ω not containing X_i or X_j, i.e., submodularity constraints of the form

$$I(X_i : X_j | X_U) \geq 0.$$

These $n + n(n-1)2^{n-3}$ independent Shannon inequalities can be expressed in terms of a $(n + n(n-1)2^{n-3}) \times (2^n - 1)$ dimensional matrix, which we call M^n_{SH}, such that for any $v \in \Gamma^*_n$, the conditions $M^n_{\mathrm{SH}} \cdot v \geq 0$ hold[4]. More generally, for $v \in \mathbb{R}^{2^n-1}_{\geq 0}$, a violation of $M^n_{\mathrm{SH}} \cdot v \geq 0$ certifies that there is no distribution $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ such that $v = \mathbf{H}(P)$. It follows that the set

$$\Gamma_n := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^{2^n-1}_{\geq 0} \mid M^n_{\mathrm{SH}} \cdot v \geq 0 \right\},$$

which is known as the *Shannon cone*, forms an outer approximation of the set, Γ^*_n, of achievable entropy vectors [26].

Example 1. *The three variable Shannon cone is*

$$\Gamma_3 = \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^7_{\geq 0} \mid M^3_{\mathrm{SH}} \cdot v \geq 0 \right\},$$

where

$$M^3_{\mathrm{SH}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The first three rows are monotonicity constraints, the remaining six ensure submodularity.

2. Beyond the Shannon cone

Zhang and Yeung have proven that in the case of two variables the Shannon cone coincides with the actual entropy cone, i.e. $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma^*_2$, and that for three random variables this holds only for the closure of the entropic cone, i.e. $\Gamma_3 = \overline{\Gamma^*_3}$ but $\Gamma_3 \neq \Gamma^*_3$ [25, 27]. For $n \geq 4$ it is known that $\overline{\Gamma^*_n} \subsetneq \Gamma_n$ [28]. Hence, further independent constraints on the set of entropy vectors are needed to fully characterise $\overline{\Gamma^*_n}$ for $n \geq 4$. The first constraint of this type, which was discovered in [25], is as follows.

Proposition 3 (Zhang & Yeung)**.** *For any four discrete random variables T, U, V and W the following inequality holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} -H(T) - H(U) - \frac{1}{2}H(V) + \frac{3}{2}H(TU) + \frac{3}{2}H(TV) \\ + \frac{1}{2}H(TW) + \frac{3}{2}H(UV) + \frac{1}{2}H(UW) - \frac{1}{2}H(VW) \\ - 2H(TUV) - \frac{1}{2}H(TUW) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

In the following the lhs of this inequality is abbreviated as $\diamond_{TUVW}$.

For $n \geq 4$ a complete characterisation of $\overline{\Gamma^*_n}$ has not been found. In this respect Matúš even showed that for $n \geq 4$ the convex cone $\overline{\Gamma^*_n}$ is not polyhedral, meaning that it cannot be characterised by finitely many linear inequalities [29]. Two infinite families of valid inequalities are given in the following.

Proposition 4 (Matúš)**.** *Let T, U, V and W be random variables and let $s \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the following inequalities hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} s\left[I(T:U|V) + I(T:U|W) + I(V:W) - I(T:U)\right] \\ + I(T:V|U) + \frac{s(s+1)}{2}\left[I(U:V|T) + I(T:U|V)\right] \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

$$\begin{aligned} s\left[I(U:V|T) + 2I(T:U|V) + I(T:U|W) + I(V:W)\right. \\ \left. - I(T:U)\right] + I(T:V|U) + \frac{s(s-1)}{2}\left[I(U:W|T)\right. \\ \left. + I(T:U|W)\right] \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

For $s = 1$ both inequalities are equivalent to $\diamond_{TUVW} \geq 0$.

Systematic searches for further entropic inequalities for $n = 4$ have been conducted in [30, 31]. These searches recover many of the previously discovered inequalities [28, 32, 33]; in particular the inequality of Proposition 3 is re-derived and even shown to be implied by tighter ones [31]. In the same article, several rules to generate families of inequalities like the ones from Proposition 4 have been suggested. Note that while these procedures recover the inequalities (6), it is not known whether the second family (7) can be recovered similarly.

The search in [31] is based on the idea of considering additional random variables that obey certain constraints and then deriving four variable inequalities from the known identities for five or more random variables

[4] This condition is to be interpreted as the requirement that each component of $M^n_{\mathrm{SH}} \cdot v$ is non-negative.

(see also [28, 29]). This is formally captured by the *copy lemma*, which is explained in Appendix A 1. Note that for more than four variables, a few additional inequalities are known as well (see Appendix A 2).

Curiously, to our knowledge, all known relevant entropy inequalities that are not of Shannon type can be written as a positive linear combination of the *Ingleton quantity*

$$I(T:U|V) + I(T:U|W) + I(V:W) - I(T:U) \qquad (8)$$

and conditional mutual information terms. We will make use of this property in Section III A 1.

3. Inner approximations

For the four variable entropy cone Γ_4^*, an inner approximation is also known. It is defined as the region constrained by the Shannon inequalities and the six permutations of the so-called Ingleton inequality [34]

$$I(T:U|V) + I(T:U|W) + I(V:W) - I(T:U) \geq 0, \quad (9)$$

for random variables T, U, V and W. These inequalities can be concisely written as a matrix $M_{\mathrm{I}} \in \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^{15}$. The constrained region is called the *Ingleton region*

$$\Gamma^I := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^{15}_{\geq 0} \mid M^4_{\mathrm{SH}} \cdot v \geq 0 \text{ and } M_{\mathrm{I}} \cdot v \geq 0 \right\},$$

and has the property that $v \in \Gamma^I$ implies $v \in \Gamma_n^*$ [35, 36]. However, the Ingleton inequalities are not obeyed by all entropy vectors.

Example 2. *Let T, U, V and W be four jointly distributed random variables. Let V and W be uniform random bits and let $T = \mathrm{AND}(\neg V, \neg W)$ and $U = \mathrm{AND}(V, W)$. This distribution [29] leads to the entropy vector*

$$v \approx (0.81, 0.81, 1, 1, 1.50, 1.50, 1.50, 1.50, 1.50, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2),$$

for which

$$I(T:U|V) + I(T:U|W) + I(V:W) - I(T:U) \approx -0.12$$

in violation of the Ingleton inequality (9).

B. Quantum entropy cone

This is defined analogously to the classical case, but with the Shannon entropy replaced by the von Neumann entropy. It was first considered in [37]. Let $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ denote the set of all density operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.

Definition 5. *The von Neumann entropy of a density operator $\rho_X \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_X)$ is defined as*

$$H(X) := -\operatorname{tr}(\rho_X \log_2(\rho_X)).$$

The quantum conditional entropy, mutual- and conditional mutual information are defined as in the classical case via Equations (1), (2) and (3) with the von Neumann entropy replacing the Shannon entropy. Although the same notation is used for both, for all these entropic quantities it will be clear from the context whether we are working with classical or quantum systems.

For multi-party quantum states a description in terms of entropy vectors has been introduced by Pippenger [37]. Let $\rho_\Omega \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_\Omega)$ be an n-party quantum state with subsystems labelled as $\Omega := \{X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n\}$, where $n \geq 2$. The entropy of any subsystem $X_S \subseteq \Omega$ is defined using the reduced state, ρ_{X_S}, on the respective subsystems. The entropy of a state ρ_Ω and of all of its subsystems can be represented as a vector in $\mathbb{R}^{2^n-1}$, denoted as $\mathbf{H}(\rho_\Omega)$ in the following. The set of all such entropy vectors of n-party quantum states is

$$\Xi_n^* := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^{2^n-1}_{\geq 0} \mid \exists \rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}) \text{ s.t. } v = \mathbf{H}(\rho) \right\}.$$

As in the classical case, the topological closure $\overline{\Xi_n^*}$ is a convex cone [37].

The following constraints give rise to an outer approximation to the set of entropy vectors Ξ_n^*[5]:

- Weak monotonicity: For all X_S, X_T, $X_U \subseteq \Omega$,

$$H(X_S) + H(X_T) \leq H(X_S \cup X_U) + H(X_T \cup X_U). \quad (10)$$

- Strong subadditivity: For all X_S, $X_T \subseteq \Omega$

$$H(X_S \cap X_T) + H(X_S \cup X_T) \leq H(X_S) + H(X_T). \quad (11)$$

Strong subadditivity and weak monotonicity of the von Neumann entropy were derived in [38].[6]

The only difference to the classical Shannon inequalities are the weak-monotonicity constraints, which replace monotonicity. Due to the close analogy with the classical case, we call (10) and (11) collectively the *von Neumann inequalities*. They can be generated from a minimal set of $n2^{n-2} + n(n-1)2^{n-3}$ inequalities [37]. These comprise $n(n-1)2^{n-3}$ strong subadditivity inequalities that are equivalent to the minimal submodularity constraints discussed in the classical case, and $n2^{n-2}$ weak monotonicity inequalities. The latter correspond to the cases of (10) where $X_U = X_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$, with $X_S \cup X_T \cup \{X_i\} = \Omega$, and with $X_{i+1} \in X_S$ (or, when $X_U = X_n$, $X_1 \in X_S$) to avoid double counting.

As in the classical case the entropies are implicitly taken to be positive. The $n2^{n-2} + n(n-1)2^{n-3}$ constraints

[5] Like for Shannon entropy it is implicitly understood that $H(\{\}) = 0$.

[6] Note that weak monotonicity is the dual of strong subadditivity in the sense that the two inequalities can be derived from each other by considering purifications of the corresponding quantum states [39].

can be written in terms of a matrix M^n_{VN} as $M^n_{\mathrm{VN}} \cdot v \geq 0$ for a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^{2^n-1}_{\geq 0}$. This yields the following outer approximation to the quantum entropy cone

$$\Xi_n := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^{2^n-1}_{\geq 0} \mid M^n_{\mathrm{VN}} \cdot v \geq 0 \right\}.$$

For $n \leq 3$ the topological closure of the set of entropy vectors $\overline{\Xi^*_n}$ is equal to the outer approximation defined by Ξ_n, but it is not known whether this remains the case for any $n \geq 4$ [37]. The question of whether this may hold has been investigated in [40] and [41]. Infinitely many inequalities for the von Neumann entropy of a four-party quantum state were found, none of which follow from the von Neumann inequalities. However, these inequalities are only proven to hold if some of the subadditivity constraints are obeyed with equality. Thus, they only demonstrate a separation of Ξ^*_n and its outer approximation Ξ_n on the boundary of the latter. This is not sufficient to decide whether the closure $\overline{\Xi^*_n}$ coincides with the cone spanned by means of the von Neumann inequalities (in our language the aforementioned work shows that $\Xi^*_n \subsetneq \Xi_n$, but does not establish $\overline{\Xi^*_n} \subsetneq \Xi_n$). An unconstrained inequality has not been found so far, but has been conjectured [40]. Hence, all linear inequalities for the von Neumann entropy that are known to be generally valid are von Neumann inequalities. A natural place to look for other inequalities is to take the classical non-Shannon inequalities and investigate whether these hold for quantum states (after replacing the Shannon entropy with the von Neumann entropy). As far as we are aware, there are no known quantum violations of any such inequalities, in spite of numerical searches in low dimension [41].

A characterisation of the entropy cone for general four-party quantum states is thus not known — just as in the classical case. However, partial results have recently been obtained [42, 43] for so-called stabilizer states [44, 45].

Due to the replacement of monotonicity by weak monotonicity, the quantum entropy cone, $\overline{\Xi^*_n}$, and its outer approximation, Ξ_n, are strictly larger than their respective classical counterparts, $\overline{\Gamma^*_n}$ and Γ_n.

C. Entropy cone with causal constraints

So far we have discussed the case of random variables with an arbitrary joint distribution. However, if there are known causal relations between these, then such distributions satisfy additional constraints. These additional constraints can be conveniently represented with a causal structure.

Definition 6. *A* causal structure *is a set of variables arranged in a directed acyclic graph (DAG), in which a subset of the nodes is assigned as observed.*

The directed edges of the graph are intended to represent causation, perhaps by propagation of some influence, and cycles are excluded to avoid the well-known paradoxes associated with causal loops. We will interpret causal structures in different ways depending on the supposed physics of whatever is mediating the causal influence.[7]

1. Classical causal structures

In the classical case, the causal relations among a set of random variables can be explored by means of the theory of Bayesian networks. An elaborate introduction to the topic can be found in [48, 49]. We proceed to summarize the parts relevant to our work.

Classical causal structures are described in terms of random variables.

Definition 7. *Let X_1, X_2 and X_3 be three random variables. Then X_1 and X_2 are said to be conditionally independent given X_3 if and only if their joint mass function $P_{\mathrm{X_1X_2X_3}}$ can be written as*

$$P_{\mathrm{X_1X_2X_3}} = P_{\mathrm{X_1|X_3}} P_{\mathrm{X_2|X_3}} P_{\mathrm{X_3}}.$$

Conditional independence of X_1 and X_2 given X_3 is denoted as

$$X_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp X_2 | X_3.$$

Note that the two variables X_1 and X_2 are (unconditionally) independent if $P_{\mathrm{X_1X_2}} = P_{\mathrm{X_1}} P_{\mathrm{X_2}}$, concisely written as $X_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp X_2$.

With reference to a DAG, G, with a subset of nodes X, we will use $X^{\downarrow}$ to denote the ancestors of X and $X^{\uparrow}$ to denote the descendants of X. The parents of X are represented by $X^{\downarrow_1}$ and the non-descendants are $X^{\updownarrow}$.

To define a classical causal structure we need the concept of compatibility.

Definition 8. *Let G be a DAG with nodes $\{X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n\}$. A probability mass function $P_{\mathrm{X_1X_2\ldots X_n}} \in \mathcal{P}_n$ is* compatible *with G if it can be decomposed as*

$$P_{\mathrm{X_1X_2\ldots X_n}} = \prod_i P_{\mathrm{X_i|X_i^{\downarrow_1}}}.$$

Definition 9. *A* classical causal structure *is a causal structure in which each node of the DAG has a corresponding random variable, and the joint distribution of these is compatible with the DAG.*

In the following we will indicate that a causal structure C is classical by a superscript C^{C}.

[7] Note that this definition of a causal structure does not coincide with that of a chronological structure/causal order as used in e.g. [46, 47]. The latter is a transitive relation intended to convey a notion of future, while in the present work the arrows are intended to represent direct causation, which is not transitive.

In general the constraint given by Definition 8 encodes numerous independences. However, establishing whether a particular set of variables is conditionally independent of another is more easily seen from the graph using the so-called d-separation criterion.

Definition 10. *Let X, Y and Z be three pairwise disjoint sets of nodes in a classical causal structure with DAG G. The sets X and Y are said to be* d-separated *by Z, if Z blocks any path from any node in X to any node in Y.*

A path is blocked *by Z, if the path contains one of the following: $i \to z \to j$ or $i \leftarrow z \to j$ for some nodes i, j and a node $z \in Z$ in that path, or if the path contains $i \to k \leftarrow j$, where $k \notin Z$.*

The d-separation of the nodes in a DAG is directly related to the conditional independence of its variables. The following proposition corresponds to Theorem 1.2.5 from [49], previously introduced in [50]. It justifies the application of d-separation as a means to identify independent variables.

Proposition 11 (Verma & Pearl)**.** *Let G be a DAG and let X, Y and Z be pairwise disjoint subsets of nodes in G. If a probability distribution P is compatible with G, then the d-separation of X and Y by Z implies the conditional independence $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y|Z$. Conversely, if for every distribution P compatible with G the conditional independence $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y|Z$ holds, then X is d-separated from Y by Z in G.*

The compatibility of probability distributions with a DAG is conveniently determined with the following proposition, which has also been called the parental or local Markov condition before (Theorem 1.2.7 in [49]).

Proposition 12 (Pearl)**.** *Let G be a DAG. A probability distribution P is compatible with G if and only if every variable in G is independent of its non-descendants, conditioned on its parents.*

Hence, to establish whether a probability distribution is compatible with a certain DAG, it is enough to check that every variable X in the DAG is independent of its non-descendants $X^{\nmid}$ given its parents $X^{\downarrow_1}$, concisely written as

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp X^{\nmid} | X^{\downarrow_1} , \tag{12}$$

i.e., to check one constraint for each variable. In particular, it is not necessary to explicitly check for all possible sets of nodes whether they obey the independence relations of the DAG implied by d-separation. Each such constraint can be conveniently expressed as[8]

$$I(X : X^{\nmid} | X^{\downarrow_1}) = 0. \tag{13}$$

[8] To see this, note that the relative entropy $D(P\|Q) := \sum_i p_i \log\left(\frac{p_i}{q_i}\right)$ satisfies $D(P\|Q) = 0 \Leftrightarrow P = Q$, and that $I(X : X^{\nmid} | X^{\downarrow_1}) = D(P_{XX^{\nmid}X^{\downarrow_1}} \| P_{X|X^{\downarrow_1}} P_{X^{\nmid}|X^{\downarrow_1}} P_{X^{\downarrow_1}})$.



Figure 1. While in the top left causal structure $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$, the other three networks share the conditional independence relation $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y|Z$. This illustrates that the conditional independences are not sufficient to characterise the causal links among a set of random variables.

While the conditional independence relations capture some features of the causal structure, they are insufficient to completely capture the causal relations between variables, as illustrated in Figure 1. In this case, the probability distributions themselves are unable to capture the difference between these causal structures: correlations are insufficient to determine causal links between random variables. External interventions allow for the exploration of causal links, beyond the conditional independences [49]. However, we do not consider these here.

Let C^{C} be a classical causal structure involving n random variables $\{X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n\}$. Its conditional independencies impose constraints on the set of achievable probability distributions. The restricted set of distributions compatible with the causal structure C^{C} is

$$\mathcal{P}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) := \left\{ P \in \mathcal{P}_n \mid P = \prod_{i=1}^{n} P_{\mathrm{X_i}|\mathrm{X_i^{\downarrow_1}}} \right\}.$$

The restrictions on the allowed distributions also restrict the corresponding entropy cones. Due to Proposition 12 there are at most n independent conditional independence equalities (13) in the causal structure C^{C}. Their coefficients can be concisely written in terms of a matrix $M_{\mathrm{CI}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$, where CI stands for conditional independence.

Definition 13. *For a causal structure C^{C}*

$$\Gamma^*\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) := \left\{ v \in \Gamma_n^* \mid M_{\mathrm{CI}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \cdot v = 0 \right\} \text{ and}$$
$$\Gamma\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) := \left\{ v \in \Gamma_n \mid M_{\mathrm{CI}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \cdot v = 0 \right\}.$$

Analogously to before, $\Gamma\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ is an outer approximation of $\Gamma^*\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$. The following lemma justifies the notation we use for $\Gamma^*\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$; it is the set of achievable entropy vectors in the causal structure C^{C}.

Lemma 14. *Let C^{C} be a causal structure, then*

$$\Gamma^*\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) = \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{2^n-1} \mid \exists P = \prod_{i=1}^{n} P_{\mathrm{X_i}|\mathrm{X_i^{\downarrow_1}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n \text{ s.t. } v = \mathbf{H}(P) \right\}.$$

Furthermore, its topological closure,

$$\overline{\Gamma^*}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) = \left\{ v \in \overline{\Gamma_n^*} \mid M_{\mathrm{CI}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \cdot v = 0 \right\},$$

is a convex cone.

The proof of this Lemma is deferred to Appendix B. The convexity of $\overline{\Gamma^*}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ is crucial for our considerations in the following sections. Note that in spite of the convexity of $\overline{\Gamma^*}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$, the set $\mathcal{P}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ is generally not convex. Thus significant information about the achievable correlations among the random variables is lost via the mapping from $\mathcal{P}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ to the corresponding entropy vectors. We discuss this issue further in Section IV.

2. Classical observed scenarios

In many scenarios we may suspect that additional unobserved variables are the cause of the correlations between the variables we observe. These additional variables can yield additional constraints on the possible distributions of the observed variables, a well-known example being a Bell inequality [1][9]. More generally we would like to infer sets of constraints on the observed variables that follow from the presence of unobserved variables.

For a causal structure on n random variables $\{X_1,\ X_2,\ \dots\ ,\ X_n\}$, the restriction to the set of observed variables is called its *marginal scenario*, denoted $\mathcal{M}$. Here, we assume that the first $k \leq n$ variables are observed and the remaining $n-k$ are not. We are thus interested in the correlations among the first k variables that can be obtained as the marginal of some distribution over all n variables.

Without any causal restrictions the set of all probability distributions of the k observed variables is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}} &:= \left\{P \in \mathcal{P}_k \mid P = \sum_{X_{k+1},\dots,X_n} P_{\mathrm{X_1X_2\dots X_n}}\right\}\\ &= \mathcal{P}_k,\end{aligned}$$

i.e., the set of all joint probability distributions of k random variables.

For a classical causal structure C^{C} on the set of variables $\{X_1,\ X_2,\ \dots\ ,\ X_n\}$, marginalising all distributions $P \in \mathcal{P}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ over the $n-k$ unobserved variables leads to the set

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) := \left\{P \in \mathcal{P}_k \mid P = \sum_{X_{k+1},\dots,X_n} \prod_{i=1}^{n} P_{\mathrm{X_i}|\mathrm{X_i^{\downarrow_1}}}\right\}.$$

Note that, in contrast to the unrestricted case, in general this set of distributions is not recovered by considering a causal structure that involves only the k observed random variables.

Within the entropic picture, marginalising corresponds to eliminating the coordinates representing entropies of sets of variables that contain at least one unobserved variable. This corresponds to a projection of a cone in $\mathbb{R}^{2^n-1}$ to its marginal cone in $\mathbb{R}^{2^k-1}$ [20]. We will denote this projection $\pi_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathbb{R}^{2^n-1} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{2^k-1}$. It gives all entropy vectors w of the observed sets of variables, i.e., of the marginal scenario $\mathcal{M}$, for which there exists at least one entropy vector v in the original scenario with matching entropies on the observed variables.

The projection of the whole set of entropy vectors, Γ^*, could be obtained by discarding the components that are projected away from every single entropy vector $v \in \Gamma^*$. For a convex cone such as $\overline{\Gamma^*}$, its projection can be more efficiently determined from the projection of its extremal rays. In the dual description of the entropic cone in terms of its facets (i.e., its inequality description) the transition to the marginal scenario can be made computationally by eliminating all entropies of sets of variables not contained in $\mathcal{M}$ from the system of inequalities. The standard algorithm that achieves this is Fourier-Motzkin elimination [52], which has been used in this context in [19, 20].

Without causal restrictions, the entropy cone Γ_n^* is projected to its marginal cone

$$\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}} := \left\{w \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{2^k-1} \mid \exists v \in \Gamma_n^* \text{ s.t. } w = \pi_{\mathcal{M}}(v)\right\}.$$

Note that if we marginalise Γ_n^* over $n-k$ variables we recover the set of all entropy vectors of k random variables, i.e.,

$$\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}} = \Gamma^*_k.$$

The same projection method applies to the approximations of Γ_n^*. The Shannon cone Γ_n is projected to the k variable Shannon cone with the mapping $\pi_{\mathcal{M}}$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} &:= \left\{w \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{2^k-1} \mid \exists v \in \Gamma_n \text{ s.t. } w = \pi_{\mathcal{M}}(v)\right\}\\ &= \left\{w \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{2^k-1} \mid M^k_{\mathrm{SH}} \cdot w \geq 0\right\}\\ &= \Gamma_k.\end{aligned}$$

This follows because the n variable Shannon constraints contain the corresponding k variable constraints as a subset, and since any vector in Γ_k can be extended to a vector in Γ_n, for instance by taking $H(X_{k+1}) = H(X_{k+2}) = \dots = H(X_n) = 0$ and $H(X_S \cup X_T) = H(X_S)$ for any $T \subseteq \{X_{k+1},\ X_{k+2},\ \dots\ ,\ X_n\}$.

Given a classical causal structure C^{C} the same elimination procedure can be applied. We will be interested in the set

$$\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) := \left\{w \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{2^k-1} \mid \exists v \in \Gamma^*\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \text{ s.t. } w = \pi_{\mathcal{M}}(v)\right\}.$$

The following lemma confirms that this is the set of entropy vectors of the marginal scenario $\mathcal{M}$ and thus also formally justifies the method of projecting the sets directly.

Lemma 15. *$\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ is the set of entropy vectors compatible with the marginal scenario of the classical causal structure C^{C}, i.e.,*

$$\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) = \left\{w \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{2^k-1} \mid \exists P \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \text{ s.t. } w = \mathbf{H}(P)\right\}.$$

[9] For a detailed discussion of the significance of Bell inequality violation on classical causal structures see [51].

Note that $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ is by construction a convex cone, since the variable elimination maps convex cones to convex cones.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}$ denote the set on the rhs of the statement in the lemma. Note that $w \in \Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ implies that there exists $v \in \Gamma^*\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ s.t. $w = \pi_{\mathcal{M}}(v)$. Using Lemma 14, we have $v = \mathbf{H}(P)$ for some $P = \prod_i P_{\mathrm{X_i}|\mathrm{X_i^{\downarrow_1}}}$. If we take $P' = \sum_{X_{k+1},\ldots,X_n} P$ then $w = \mathbf{H}(P')$ and hence $w \in \mathcal{F}$.

Conversely, $w \in \mathcal{F}$ implies that there exists $P' \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ s.t. $w = \mathbf{H}(P')$ and hence there exists $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$ such that $P' = \sum_{X_{k+1},\ldots,X_n} P$. If we take $v = \mathbf{H}(P)$, then $w = \pi_{\mathcal{M}}(v)$ and hence $w \in \Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$. □

An outer approximation to $\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) &:= \left\{w \in \mathbb{R}^{2^k-1}_{\geq 0} \mid \exists v \in \Gamma\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \text{ s.t. } w = \pi_{\mathcal{M}}(v)\right\} \\ &= \left\{w \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \mid M_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \cdot w \geq 0\right\},\end{aligned}$$

where $M_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ is the matrix obtained via Fourier-Motzkin elimination and encodes the set of inequalities on $\mathbb{R}^{2^k-1}_{\geq 0}$ that are implied by the fact that $M_{\mathrm{CI}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)\cdot v = 0$ and $M^n_{\mathrm{SH}} \cdot v \geq 0$ hold on $\mathbb{R}^{2^n-1}_{\geq 0}$ (except for the k-variable Shannon constraints which are already included in $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}$). Hence $\Gamma\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \subsetneq \Gamma$ and $\Gamma^*\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \subsetneq \Gamma^*$ imply

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) &\subseteq \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}, \\ \Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) &\subseteq \Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}},\end{aligned}$$

respectively.

3. *Quantum causal structures*

A quantum causal structure differs from its classical counterpart in that unobserved systems correspond to shared quantum states.

Definition 16. *A* quantum causal structure *is a causal structure in which for each observed node there is a corresponding random variable, and for each unobserved node there is a corresponding quantum system.*

In the following, we will denote the quantum version of a causal structure C by C^{Q}. In fact, quantum causal structures can be viewed as special cases of generalised Bayesian networks [53], which additionally consider the possibility of post-quantum systems, such as non-local boxes [54, 55], on unobserved nodes [56]. A complementary approach to quantum causal structures is presented in [57].

In a classical causal structure the edges of the DAG represent the propagation of classical information, and, at a node with incoming edges, the random variable there can be generated by applying an arbitrary function to its parents. We are hence implicitly taking it that all the information about the parents is transmitted to its children (otherwise the set of allowed functions would be restricted). This does not pose a problem since classical information can be copied. In the quantum case, on the other hand, the no-cloning theorem means that the children of a node cannot (in general) all have access to the same information as is present at that node. Furthermore, the analogue of performing arbitrary functions in the classical case is replaced by arbitrary quantum operations.[10] To account for these differences we need to introduce a little additional structure and terminology.

The entropic considerations outlined in this section follow [20]. To simplify the treatment for the moment we will consider quantum causal structures with only two generations and in which the unobserved variables are in the first generation and the observed variables in the second. (In Section IV A, where a more general treatment is required, we follow the framework from [56].)

Let C^{Q} be such a causal structure with k observed nodes (labelled $X_1, \ldots, X_k$) and $n-k$ unobserved nodes (labelled $A_1, \ldots, A_{n-k}$). For each directed edge in the graph there is a corresponding subsystem with Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{(X_i,A_j)}$. The allowed initial states take the form $\rho \in \{\rho_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \rho_{n-k}\}$, where ρ_j is a valid density operator for $j = 1, \ldots, n-k$ and the Hilbert space that ρ_j is defined on is the tensor product $\bigotimes_i \mathcal{H}_{(X_i,A_j)}$, where i runs over all children of the jth node. The state ρ_j is that associated with the unobserved node j, and $\{(X_i, A_j)\}_i$ are its associated subsystems (we will sometimes use $A, B, \ldots$ to represent unobserved nodes and $X, Y, \ldots$ to represent observed ones and then compress the subsystem names to A_X rather than (X, A), for instance). The ancestors of a node are all the subsystems associated with the ancestral nodes; this includes those subsystems of the ancestral nodes associated with edges to its other children, if there are any.

The outcomes are then generated by performing a positive operator valued measure (POVM) for each of the k second generation nodes. The ith POVM acts on the Hilbert space $\bigotimes_j \mathcal{H}_{(X_i,A_j)}$, where j runs over all the parental nodes of the ith node. The set of distributions that can be generated is then given by the Born rule on states and measurements of this form. We denote this set by $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)$.

The set of entropy vectors of all probability distributions over the observed nodes $P \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)$ is

$$\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right) := \left\{w \in \mathbb{R}^{2^k-1}_{\geq 0} \mid \exists P \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right) \text{ s.t. } w = \mathbf{H}(P)\right\}.$$

To approximate $\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)$, the procedure for classical causal structures can be adapted, as detailed in [20].

In the quantum case an entropy is associated to each random variable and to each subsystem (equivalently

[10] For observed nodes these operations are restricted to produce classical states as outputs.



Figure 2. Causal structure of Example 3. The source A shares a quantum system $\rho_A \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$, where $\mathcal{H}_A \cong \mathcal{H}_{A_\mathrm{X}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A_\mathrm{Y}}$. The subsystem A_X is measured to produce X and likewise for Y. The subsystems A_X and A_Y are both considered to be parents of X and Y.

each edge of the DAG). For convenience of exposition, we will use the term subsystem to refer to either of these (in a sense this corresponds to interpreting random variables as diagonal density operators).

Because of the impossibility of cloning, the outcomes and the quantum systems that led to them do not simultaneously exist. Therefore there is no multi-party quantum state that simultaneously describes all subsystems[11] and it does not make sense to talk about the joint entropy of the states and outcomes. More concretely, if a system A is measured to produce X, then ρ_{AX} is not defined and hence neither is $H(AX)$.

Definition 17. *Two subsystems in a quantum causal structure C^Q* coexist *if neither of them is a quantum ancestor of the other. A set of subsystems that mutually coexist is termed a* coexisting set.

A quantum causal structure may have several coexisting subsets. Only within such subsets is there a well defined joint quantum state and joint entropy.

Example 3. *Consider the quantum causal structure illustrated in Figure 2. The quantum node A has two associated subsystems A_X and A_Y. The correlations seen at the two observed nodes, X and Y, are formed by measurement on the respective subsystems A_X and A_Y. The coexisting sets in this causal structure are $\{A_\mathrm{X},\ A_\mathrm{Y}\}$, $\{A_\mathrm{X},\ Y\}$, $\{A_\mathrm{Y},\ X\}$ and $\{X,\ Y\}$, and their (non-empty) proper subsets, i.e. there are 8 coexisting sets.*

Note that without loss of generality we can assume that the initial states $\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_{n-k}$ are pure. This is because any mixed state can be purified, and if the measurement operators are then taken to act trivially on the purifying systems the same statistics are observed. In the causal structure of Example 3, this implies that ρ_A can be considered to be pure and thus $H(A_\mathrm{X}A_\mathrm{Y}) = 0$. The Schmidt decomposition then implies that $H(A_\mathrm{X}) = H(A_\mathrm{Y})$. This is computationally useful as it reduces the number of free parameters in the entropic description of the scenario.

Among the subsystems in each coexisting set all submodularity constraints (5) are obeyed whether that subsystem is classical or quantum. In the sets that include classical and quantum variables, weak monotonicity (10) replaces monotonicity in cases where the corresponding monotonicity constraint (4) could have entanglement between X_T and $X_S \setminus X_T$. If the state across X_T and $X_S \setminus X_T$ is necessarily separable — for instance if we condition either on the classical or quantum part of a cq-state — then monotonicity holds [59]. In Example 3, weak monotonicity is thus only relevant for the coexisting set $\{A_\mathrm{X},\ A_\mathrm{Y}\}$, whereas in all others monotonicity holds. Altogether, these considerations lead to a set of basic inequalities containing some Shannon and some von Neumann inequalities, which are conveniently expressed in a matrix $M_\mathrm{B}\left(C^\mathrm{Q}\right)$.

The conditional independence constraints in a quantum scenario cannot be identified by a criterion such as Proposition 12, because conditioning on a parent is not meaningful when the latter is quantum and does not coexist with the subsystem in question. Within the coexisting sets, however, the conditional independences among the subsystems hold irrespective of whether they are quantum or not. For sets of subsystems that do not all coexist, we restrict our considerations to the following observation, which we will apply later.

Observation 18. *With respect to a DAG G, two subsets X and Y are independent if they do not share ancestors in G and if neither contains an ancestor of the other. Note that such sets of subsystems are by definition members of a coexisting set and can be represented in terms of a product state $\rho_{XY} = \rho_X \otimes \rho_Y$ and thus always obey $I(X:Y) = 0$.*

We can define a matrix $M_\mathrm{QCI}\left(C^\mathrm{Q}\right)$ comprising the independences of coexisting subsets according to the above observation. In Example 3, there are no such independences because all subsystems have A as an ancestor.

Among the variables that do not coexist, some are obtained from others by means of quantum operations and, in particular, by measurements. These variables are thus related by data processing inequalities (DPI) [60].

Proposition 19 (DPI)**.** *Let $\rho_{\mathrm{X_S X_T}} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{X_\mathrm{S}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{X_\mathrm{T}})$ and $\mathcal{E}$ be a completely positive trace preserving (CPTP) map on $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{X_\mathrm{T}})$[12] leading to a state $\rho'_{\mathrm{X_S X_T}}$. Then*

$$I(X_\mathrm{S}:X_\mathrm{T})_{\rho'_{\mathrm{X_S X_T}}} \leq I(X_\mathrm{S}:X_\mathrm{T})_{\rho_{\mathrm{X_S X_T}}}. \tag{14}$$

Note that the map from a quantum state to the diagonal state with entries equal to the outcome probabilities of a measurement is a CPTP map and hence also obeys the DPI. Applied to the variables of a quantum causal structure C^Q, the data processing inequalities provide an additional set of constraints, which can be expressed

[11] Attempts to circumvent this have been made, see for example [58].

[12] Note that in general $\mathcal{E}$ can be a map between operators on different Hilbert spaces, i.e. $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}'_{X_\mathrm{T}}) \to \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}''_{X_\mathrm{T}})$. However, as we can consider these operators to act on the same larger Hilbert space we can w.l.o.g. take $\mathcal{E}$ to be a map on this larger space, which we call $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{X_\mathrm{T}})$.

in terms of a matrix inequality $M_{\mathrm{DPI}}\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)\cdot v \geq 0$.[13] In Example 3, A_{X} is processed to X, which gives $I(X:Y) \leq I(A_X:Y)$ and $I(X:A_Y) \leq I(A_X:A_Y)$, for instance.

All the above (in)equalities are necessary conditions for a vector to be an entropy vector compatible with the causal structure C^{Q}. They can be expressed as constraints on a cone in $\mathbb{R}^m_{\geq 0}$, where m is the total number of coexisting sets of C^{Q},

$$\Gamma\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right) \coloneqq \left\{v \in \mathbb{R}^m_{\geq 0} \mid M_{\mathrm{B}}\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)\cdot v \geq 0, \right. \\ \left. M_{\mathrm{QCI}}\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)\cdot v = 0, \text{ and } M_{\mathrm{DPI}}\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)\cdot v \geq 0\right\}.$$

From the entropic restrictions $\Gamma\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)$, we can use Fourier-Motzkin elimination to derive an outer approximation to the entropy cone $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)$ of the observed scenario $\mathcal{M}$ of C^{Q}. This leads to

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right) \coloneqq \left\{w \in \mathbb{R}^{2^k-1}_{\geq 0} \mid \exists v \in \Gamma\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right) \text{ s.t. } w = \pi_{\mathcal{M}}(v)\right\} \\ = \left\{w \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \mid M_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)\cdot w \geq 0\right\}.$$

The matrix $M_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)$ encodes all (in)equalities on $\mathbb{R}^{2^k-1}_{\geq 0}$ implied by $M_{\mathrm{B}}\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)\cdot v \geq 0$, $M_{\mathrm{QCI}}\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)\cdot v = 0$ and $M_{\mathrm{DPI}}\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)\cdot v \geq 0$ (except for the Shannon inequalities, which are already included in $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}$). Note that

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \subseteq \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right) \subseteq \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}},$$

where the first holds because all inequalities relevant for quantum states hold in the classical case as well.[14]

In the following, we focus on the comparison of the observed correlations of classical and quantum causal structures. Progress towards a better understanding of the differences has recently been made with the development of procedures to construct non-linear Bell inequalities [61–63]. We are, however, far from an exhaustive characterisation of the corresponding sets of correlations even for simple causal structures. Moreover, computational hardness results suggest that such a characterisation is unlikely to exist [64, 65].

Here, we attempt to compare the cones $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ and $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)$ for different causal structures C, so as to evaluate whether the entropy vector approach is useful for making progress on this problem. In the next section, we focus on scenarios involving three parties, the smallest non-trivial scenario, which has not been fully understood.

[13] There are also DPIs for conditional mutual information, e.g., $I(A:B|C)_{\rho'_{ABC}} \leq I(A:B|C)_{\rho_{ABC}}$ for $\rho'_{ABC} = (\mathcal{I}\otimes\mathcal{E}\otimes\mathcal{I})(\rho_{ABC})$, but these are implied by Proposition 19, so they need not be treated separately.

[14] This can be seen by thinking of a classical source as made up of two or more (perfectly correlated) random variables as its subsystems, which are sent to its children and processed there. The Shannon inequalities hold among all of these variables (and also imply any weak monotonicity constraints). The classical independence relations include the quantum ones but may add constraints that involve conditioning on any of the variables' ancestors. These (in)equalities are tighter than the DPIs, which are hence not considered explicitly.



Figure 3. Assuming no direct causation among the three observed variables X, Y and Z, the above are the only possible causal structures (up to relabelling). A, B and C denote unobserved variables.

III. TRIANGLE SCENARIO

Imagine a situation where we measure three different parameters. One might for instance go into an office, measure the room temperature, estimate the water-level of a pond outside, and count the number of books on a shelf. In many scenarios, including this simple example, it is reasonable to assume that none of these three observed variables is a cause of any of the other two. These variables might share common causes though, for example, room temperature and the water-level in the pond might both depend on the weather and the season. With the exclusion of direct causal influences among the variables, five distinct causal scenarios among the three observed variables are possible, all depicted in Figure 3.

One interesting task is to consider how to distinguish between these causal structures given a set of correlations. Several (classical) *causal discovery algorithms* have been developed for this purpose [48, 49].[15] In the present case, most of these causal structures can be distinguished by looking at independences among the observed variables, X, Y and Z. In Figure 3(a) all three variables are independent, while in Figure 3(b) X is independent of Y and Z, but Y and Z may be correlated. In Figure 3(d) X and Y are independent, but both may be correlated with Z. In the causal structure of Figure 3(c) there are no restrictions on P_{XYZ} and hence no independences among the observed variables. In Figure 3(e) the correlations are restricted, but there are also no independences among the observed variables [21]. Thus the causal structures of Figure 3(c) and (e) cannot be distinguished by studying independences among the observed variables alone. Note that independence relations are easy to check in the entropic picture where they correspond to linear constraints (cf. (13)). However, the causal structure encodes more than these independence relations, part of which can be exposed entropically.

Beyond that, within a particular causal structure,

[15] For recent progress in the quantum case, see for instance [66].



Figure 4. Triangle causal structure C_3. Three observed random variables X, Y and Z have pairwise common causes. In the classical case these common causes are random variables, A, B and C, while in the quantum case these are replaced by quantum systems (A_Y, A_Z), (B_X, B_Z) and (C_X, C_Y).

there is a separate task of deciding whether correlations are realisable classically or quantum mechanically. In the following we focus mainly on this second task, and in particular what entropy can say about it. Note, however, that the two tasks are related since having a tight characterisation of the set of correlations realisable in a particular scenario can inform both.

Whenever none of the three variables X, Y and Z share common causes, as in Figure 3(a), their joint probability distribution is a product distribution and the problem of identifying unobserved classical or quantum variables is moot. If two nodes share a common cause, for instance Y and Z in Figure 3(b), these two variables can be correlated by means of a classical or quantum common cause. In this case, the same set of correlations can be observed whether or not the causal structure is classical or quantum, i.e. $\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) = \Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)$ holds where C is the causal structure of Figure 3(b).[16] The same holds when C is the causal structure in Figure 3(c), for the same reason. In this second case any P_{XYZ} can be realised.

If two pairs of variables share a common cause each, as illustrated in Figure 3(d), the corresponding causal structure is called P_3. In this scenario, which is an example of a star graph, no non-classical quantum correlations exist either [67].[17]

[16] For any quantum state ρ_A shared at A and measured later at Y and Z, the correlations can be classically reproduced if A sends out the same classical output statistics to Y and Z directly.

[17] This is also fairly intuitive: the quantum measurements performed at X and Y could be equivalently performed at the sources B and A respectively, such that these sources distribute cq-states of the form $\sum_x P_X(x)\,|x\rangle\langle x|\otimes\rho^x_{B_Z}$ and $\sum_y P_Y(y)\,|y\rangle\langle y|\otimes\rho^y_{A_Z}$ instead. The same correlations can be achieved classically by taking random variables $B = X$ and $A = Y$ (these being distributed according to P_X and P_Y). Since $\rho^x_{B_Z}$ and $\rho^y_{A_Z}$ are functions of X and Y, the statistics formed by measuring such states can be computed classically via a probabilistic function (this function could be made deterministic by taking $B = (X, W)$, where W is distributed appropriately).

The only scenario in which the quantum and classical causal structures may generate different sets of correlations is the triangle causal structure C_3 of Figure 3(e), also displayed in Figure 4. This has received quite a bit of attention recently [19, 20, 56, 67, 68].

The causal structure C_3 has been identified as the smallest in which there exist quantum correlations that are not classically reproducible [67]. Although the scenario with post-quantum A, B and C has not been fully analysed, it is know that in any generalised probabilistic theory the inequality

$$I(X:Y) + I(X:Z) \leq H(X), \tag{15}$$

which was derived in [67] for the classical case, holds [56]. Thus, for instance, perfectly correlated bits X, Y and Z, i.e., those with joint distribution

$$P_{XYZ}(x,y,z) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & x = y = z \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

violate this inequality and can not be realised in the triangle causal structure in any such theory.

The entropy cone of C_3 has been previously considered in [19, 20] which together argue that in the marginal scenario there is no entropic separation between the Shannon cone and the classical entropy cone, i.e., that $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}) = \overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}(C_3^{\mathrm{C}})$.[18] Our findings contradict this, however, and we are able to obtain a tighter characterisation of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}(C_3^{\mathrm{C}})$ than that of [19, 20] by using non-Shannon inequalities (for further discussion of the discrepancy, see Appendix C).

A. Classical triangle scenario

1. *Probabilistic picture*

In the classical triangle causal structure C_3^{C}, the six random variables A, B, C, X, Y and Z are jointly distributed according to a distribution $P \in \mathcal{P}_6$. The subset of all probability distributions compatible with the classical triangle causal structure $\mathcal{P}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \subsetneq \mathcal{P}_6$ is

$$\mathcal{P}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) = \left\{P \in \mathcal{P}_6 \mid P = P_A P_B P_C P_{X|BC} P_{Y|AC} P_{Z|AB}\right\}.$$

We are only interested in the joint distribution of the three observed variables X, Y and Z and the corresponding marginal scenario of distributions compatible with

[18] Note that the details of this are left to the Supplementary Information of [20].

C_3^{C},

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) = \Bigg\{ P_{XYZ} \in \mathcal{P}_3 \mid P_{XYZ} = \sum_{A,B,C} P_A P_B P_C P_{X|BC} P_{Y|AC} P_{Z|AB} \Bigg\}.$$

Note that the set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ is not convex.[19]

2. Entropic picture

In the following we consider the set, $\Gamma^*(C_3^{\mathrm{C}})$, of entropy vectors in the triangle causal structure. We generally follow the procedure from [19, 20] but obtain additional as well as slightly different results.

The Shannon cone Γ_6 as well as the set of entropy vectors Γ_6^* for the six discrete random variables are supplemented with the following entropic constraints read off the causal structure C_3^{C} according to Proposition 12:

$$\begin{aligned} I(X:YZA|BC) &= 0, \\ I(Y:XZB|AC) &= 0, \\ I(Z:XYC|AB) &= 0, \\ I(A:XBC) &= 0, \\ I(B:YAC) &= 0, \\ I(C:ZAB) &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

These equalities form the matrix $M_{\mathrm{CI}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$. Note that one equality is redundant, i.e., any five of these constraints imply the sixth (cf. Lemma 34 in Appendix E). The dimension of $M_{\mathrm{CI}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ can thus be reduced by one. According to Proposition 12, these constraints imply all other conditional independence relations[20].

The set of entropy vectors compatible with C_3^{C} and its outer approximation are

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^*\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) &= \left\{ v \in \Gamma_6^* \mid M_{\mathrm{CI}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \cdot v = 0 \right\}, \\ \Gamma\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) &= \left\{ v \in \Gamma_6 \mid M_{\mathrm{CI}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \cdot v = 0 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

restricting Γ_6 and Γ_6^* respectively. Note that according to Lemma 14 the set $\overline{\Gamma^*}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ is a convex cone.

Proposition 20. *The outer approximation $\Gamma\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ to the set of entropy vectors in C_3^{C} is not tight:*

$$\overline{\Gamma^*}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \subsetneq \Gamma\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right).$$

Proof. $\overline{\Gamma^*}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \subseteq \Gamma\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ directly follows from $\overline{\Gamma_6^*} \subsetneq \Gamma_6$ (cf. Section II A), as both sets are restricted by the same set of additional equalities $M_{\mathrm{CI}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \cdot v = 0$.

To show that the inclusion is strict, we use Proposition 3, which is obeyed by any four random variables and thus also holds for any subset of four out of the six random variables in C_3^{C}. Let us consider the proposition for $(T,\ U,\ V,\ W) = (Y,\ Z,\ A,\ X)$, i.e.

$$\Diamond_{YZAX} \geq 0. \tag{18}$$

Now we choose the vector

$$\begin{aligned} v = (&2,2,2,3,3,2,4,4,5,4,3,4,4,5,3,4,4,4,5,4,4,\\ &6,6,6,4,6,4,5,6,5,5,4,6,5,6,5,5,6,5,5,6,6,\\ &6,6,6,6,6,6,6,5,6,6,5,6,6,6,6,6,6,6,6,6,6). \end{aligned}$$

We can check that this vector obeys the Shannon inequalities and (17) and thus $v \in \Gamma\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$. On the other hand, v violates (18), which implies that $v \notin \overline{\Gamma^*}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$. □

3. Entropic marginal scenario

The marginal scenario of C_3^{C} is formed by removing the unobserved nodes A, B and C. The variable elimination maps the set of entropy vectors in the six variable scenario $\Gamma^*\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ to

$$\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) = \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^7_{\geq 0} \mid \exists P \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \text{ s.t. } v = \mathbf{H}(P) \right\}.$$

From $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ we can explicitly calculate

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) = \left\{ w \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \mid M_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \cdot w \geq 0 \right\}$$

by eliminating the unobserved variables from the system of (in)equalities $M^6_{\mathrm{SH}} \cdot v \geq 0$ and $M_{\mathrm{CI}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \cdot v = 0$ to obtain $M_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$. This calculation, by means of a Fourier-Motzkin elimination, has already been performed by Chaves et al. [19, 20] who showed that in addition to M^3_{SH} there are three other types of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} -5H(X) - 5H(Y) - 5H(Z) + 4H(XY) + 4H(XZ) + 4H(YZ) - 2H(XYZ) &\geq 0, \\ -3H(X) - 3H(Y) - 3H(Z) + 2H(XY) + 2H(XZ) + 3H(YZ) - H(XYZ) &\geq 0, \\ -H(X) - H(Y) - H(Z) + H(XY) + H(XZ) &\geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

[19] This can be seen by considering the perfect correlations P_{XYZ} of (16) (which are not in $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$) as a convex combination of the distribution where X, Y and Z are always 0 and the distribution where X, Y and Z are always 1 (both of which are).

[20] Note that in the particular case of C_3^{C}, this could still be quite efficiently checked by deriving all of these relations explicitly.

Taking into account permutations this corresponds to a total of 7 additional inequalities, forming the coefficient matrix $M_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$. Note that this computation can for instance be performed with the software PORTA [69].

Since no explicit description of $\overline{\Gamma^*}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ is known, we cannot calculate $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ with a variable elimination. We know, however, that the latter is a convex cone and that

$$\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \subseteq \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right).$$

Note that no inequalities other than the Shannon constraints and the conditional independence relations have been used so far. There are, however, infinitely many additional inequalities that hold for all entropy vectors of four jointly distributed random variables, as was mentioned in Section II A. These inequalities also hold for all subsets of four of the six jointly distributed random variables in C_3^{C}.

All known non-Shannon entropy inequalities that are not rendered redundant by tighter ones can be written as the sum of an Ingleton inequality (9) and (conditional) mutual information terms (cf. Section II A). Since the latter are always positive, any non-Shannon type inequality is irrelevant (i.e., implied by existing constraints) if the causal constraints imply that the Ingleton term is non-negative. For the triangle causal structure, C_3^{C}, this drastically reduces the choice of variables for which the known additional inequalities are relevant. Before making a general statement of this form in Proposition 21, we give a short example to illustrate this idea.

Example 4. *Consider Proposition 3 with* $(T, U, V, W) = (A, B, C, X)$. *The corresponding inequality can be written as*

$$\begin{aligned} I(A:B|C) + I(A:B|X) + I(C:X) - I(A:B) \\ + I(A:C|B) + I(B:C|A) + I(A:B|C) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

In the triangle causal structure $I(A:B) = 0$ *due to the independence of* A *and* B. *Since the Shannon inequalities imply the non-negativity of the (conditional) mutual information, the above inequality is implied by the Shannon inequalities and the conditional independence constraint* $I(A:B) = 0$. *It will hence not further restrict our outer approximation.*

Proposition 21. *Consider an entropic inequality that states the non-negativity of a positive linear combination of the Ingleton quantity (9) and (conditional) mutual information terms. This inequality is implied by the Shannon inequalities (4) and (5) and the conditional independences (17) of the triangle scenario* C_3^{C} *for all possible variable choices except*

$$\begin{aligned} (T, U, V, W) &= (X, Y, Z, C) \\ &= (X, Z, Y, B) \\ &= (Y, Z, X, A), \end{aligned}$$

up to exchange of T *and* U *as well as* V *and* W.

Note that all known non-redundant entropy inequalities satisfy the conditions of this proposition, in particular the inequalities of Section II A.

Proof. For four random variables T, U, V and W, the Ingleton inequality

$$I(T:U|V) + I(T:U|W) + I(V:W) - I(T:U) \geq 0 \tag{20}$$

can be equivalently rewritten in four more ways with the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} I(T:U|V) - I(T:U) &= I(T:V|U) - I(T:V) \\ &= I(U:V|T) - I(U:V), \\ I(T:U|W) - I(T:U) &= I(T:W|U) - I(T:W) \\ &= I(U:W|T) - I(U:W). \end{aligned}$$

For the inequality (20) not to be implied by the Shannon inequalities and the conditional independences we need T, U, V and W to be such that

$$\begin{aligned} I(T:U) &> 0, \\ I(T:V) &> 0, \\ I(T:W) &> 0, \\ I(U:V) &> 0, \\ I(U:W) &> 0, \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

hold simultaneously. If the conditional independences of C_3^{C} imply that one of these mutual informations is zero then the Ingleton inequality can be expressed as a positive linear combination of (conditional) mutual information terms in one of its five equivalent forms and the corresponding non-Shannon inequality is redundant.

For the five constraints (21) to hold simultaneously, T and U have to be correlated with one another as well as with two further variables. This excludes the independent sources A, B and C as candidates for T and U; therefore $T, U \in \{X, Y, Z\}$, i.e., (T, U) is either (X, Y), (X, Z), or (Y, Z) up to permutations. Given the variables T and U, the variables V and W have to be correlated with both. This excludes the two variables in $\{A, B, C\}$ that do not lie between T and U in C_3^{C}. Hence, for each choice of T and U, the variables V and W have to be chosen as the remaining element of $\{X, Y, Z\}$ and the variable positioned opposite it in C_3^{C}.

In summary, $(T, U)(V, W)$ can only be $(X, Y)(Z, C)$, $(X, Z)(Y, B)$ and $(Y, Z)(X, A)$ up to permutations of the variables within a tuple. □

Of the 360 possible combinations of four variables, including permutations only twelve could yield relevant non-Shannon inequalities to improve the approximation to $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$. We also remark that for most of the known non-Shannon inequalities, several of the remaining twelve choices can be shown to be redundant as well.

However, by using those that remain we can show that in the causal structure C_3^{C}, the set of entropy vectors is properly contained in the outer approximation $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$.

Proposition 22. *The set of marginal entropy vectors in the classical triangle scenario is a proper subset of the corresponding marginal Shannon cone*

$$\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \subsetneq \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right).$$

This also holds for its closure $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$.

Proof. We show this computationally by adding the four inequalities[21]

$$\begin{aligned} \diamondsuit_{YZAX} &\geq 0, \\ \diamondsuit_{XZBY} &\geq 0, \\ \diamondsuit_{XYCZ} &\geq 0, \\ \diamondsuit_{YZXA} &\geq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

to $\Gamma\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ and performing the Fourier-Motzkin elimination to remove terms involving A, B and C.

The resulting set of inequalities includes the Shannon inequalities for three variables as well as the additional inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} -H(X) - H(Y) - H(Z) + H(XY) + H(XZ) &\geq 0, \\ -4H(X) - 4H(Y) - 4H(Z) + 3H(XY) + 3H(XZ) + 4H(YZ) - 2H(XYZ) &\geq 0, \\ -2H(X) - 2H(Y) - 2H(Z) + 3H(XY) + 3H(XZ) + 3H(YZ) - 4H(XYZ) &\geq 0, \\ -8H(X) - 8H(Y) - 8H(Z) + 7H(XY) + 7H(XZ) + 7H(YZ) - 5H(XYZ) &\geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

up to permutations of X, Y and Z where applicable.

These are not all obeyed by the entropy vector $v_1 = (2,3,3,4,4,5,6)$, a vertex of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$. In fact, each of our new inequalities (23) that isn't also a constraint of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ in (19) is violated by v_1 or a vector with appropriately permuted X, Y and Z. This implies that $\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \subsetneq \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$.

For each of our new inequalities we can also find vectors in the interior of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ that violate our new constraints (for instance the vector $v_2 = (11,14,14,20,20,23,28)$ violates the same inequalities as v_1 and thus also lies outside our new approximation of the triangle). We can thus exclude that the two sets only differ in a boundary region. Therefore, $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \subsetneq \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$.[22] □

4. *New outer approximation of* $\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$

The insight that $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ does not tightly approximate $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ naturally leads to the question of whether better approximations can be gained by using further non-Shannon type inequalities. Such approximations enable a more accurate distinction of the triangle causal structure from other causal structures, such as the one from Figure 3(c).

There are infinitely many linear entropic inequalities that cannot be derived from the Shannon inequalities and, even after accounting for the reduction in number discussed in the previous subsection, we cannot reduce to a finite number. The outer approximation to $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ could (potentially) be tightened further by including all such inequalities.

In principle, all the remaining inequalities should be added to the approximation to $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$. However, in practice only a small number of inequalities can be added at a time until the task of marginalising becomes infeasible. The main reason is that the Fourier-Motzkin elimination algorithm is often too slow. Applied to a system of n_0 inequalities it can yield up to $\left(\frac{n_0}{2}\right)^2$ inequalities in the first elimination step. Iterating the procedure for n steps produces up to $4 \cdot \left(\frac{n_0}{4}\right)^{2^n}$ inequalities. This doubly exponential growth of the algorithm in the worst case is the main reason for its inefficiency. The elimination algorithm can be adapted by implementing a few rules to remove some of the many redundant inequalities produced in each step. They are collectively known as Černikov rules [70, 71] and comprehensively explained in [72]. It is known, however, that the number of necessary inequalities can still grow exponentially [73]. That said, the worst case scaling may not be exhibited in our case. In fact, the inequalities defining $\Gamma\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ contain few variables each and thus lead to far fewer than the maximal number of inequalities. However, we are still limited to

[21] These are the only ones from Proposition 3 that are relevant in C_3^{C} (the last of these could be equivalently substituted, either by exchanging A with B and simultaneously exchanging X with Y or by switching A with C and X with Z).

[22] Note that this last step is not actually necessary: the violation of the inequalities is not arbitrarily small and we are dealing with linear inequalities, so the statement also follows by continuity.

adding a relatively small number of different inequalities at a time to avoid computational difficulties.

We have used the previously outlined technique to compute tighter approximations to $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$, by including a manageable number of non-Shannon inequalities at a time:

Case 1: We include all permutations of the inequality in Proposition 3 (this is provably also the only inequality derived with only one instance of the so-called copy lemma (cf. Appendix A 1) [31]) as well as the six inequalities (A1)-(A6) obtained from two instances of the copy lemma [33].

Case 2: We include all inequalities of the form given in (6) and (7) for $s = 1, 2, 3$.

The resulting sets of constraints for the outer approximation to $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ are available at [74].

We also derive some families of inequalities that hold, for example by using (6) for different values of $s \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 23. *All entropy vectors $v \in \Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ obey*

$$\begin{aligned}\left(-\frac{1}{2}s^2-\frac{3}{2}s\right)(H(X)+H(Z))+(-s-1)\,H(Y)\\ +\left(\frac{1}{2}s^2+\frac{3}{2}s+1\right)(H(XY)+H(YZ))\\ +\left(s^2+2s\right)H(XZ)+\left(-s^2-2s-1\right)H(XYZ)\geq 0,\end{aligned}\tag{24}$$

for all $s \in \mathbb{N}$. The same holds for all permutations of X, Y and Z.

Proof. The instance of inequality (6) with $(T, U, V, W) = (X, Y, Z, C)$ can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}\left(-\frac{1}{2}s^2-\frac{3}{2}s\right)H(X)+(-s-1)\,H(Y)\\ +\left(-\frac{1}{2}s^2-\frac{1}{2}s\right)H(Z)+sH(CX)\\ +sH(CY)-sH(CZ)+\left(\frac{1}{2}s^2+\frac{3}{2}s+1\right)H(XY)\\ +\left(s^2+2s\right)H(XZ)+\left(\frac{1}{2}s^2+\frac{3}{2}s+1\right)H(YZ)\\ -sH(CXY)+\left(-s^2-2s-1\right)H(XYZ)\geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Applying $I(X:Y|C) = 0$ and $I(Z:C) = 0$, all terms containing the variable C cancel, which leads to inequality (24). □

We can identify further families by comparing the computational results for different $s \in \mathbb{N}$, noting that the Fourier-Motzkin elimination algorithm combines the inequalities (6) with the same variable choices and the same Shannon inequalities in the calculation for each value of s. Extracting an explicit derivation of such a family is in general more involved than in the case of Lemma 23, these being a consequence of several permutations of (6) and Shannon inequalities.

Considering the inequalities for several $s \in \mathbb{N}$ simultaneously, however, leads to a large number of additional inequalities, which render many of the discovered families redundant. For the few orders s up to which we were able to run our calculations, the family from Lemma 23 was one of only two such families for which none of its inequalities was implied by others. The second such family is given in Appendix F. Similar considerations can be applied to (7) (see Appendix F for an example) and possibly to further families of inequalities [31].

One might imagine that adding five and six variable inequalities (such as those detailed in Appendix A 2) to $\Gamma\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ leads to further restrictions. However, it turns out that they are all rendered redundant in C_3^{C} by the Shannon inequalities and the conditional independences. This can be shown by expanding the inequalities into a linear combination of mutual information terms and a similar reasoning as is applied in the proof of Proposition 21. As they are not particularly instructive, the details of these arguments are omitted.

Conjecture 24. *Infinitely many linear inequalities are needed to characterise $\overline{\Gamma^*}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$.*

Our main evidence for this is that the family of inequalities (6), used by Matúš to prove that the analogue of this conjecture holds for $\overline{\Gamma^*_4}$, leads to infinite families of inequalities for C_3^{C} after marginalising (cf. Lemma 23). We can not exclude, however, that this family of inequalities are rendered redundant by a tighter inequality that cuts off the whole region of the cone $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ for which this family of inequalities provides additional restrictions. The same might in principle hold for other families derived either from (6) or from other families of four variable inequalities.

5. *Inner approximation of* $\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$

That the Ingleton region is an inner approximation to Γ^*_4, as detailed in Section II A, motivates us to look into the implications of Ingleton's inequality for the classical causal structure C_3^{C}. In the following, we add all permutations of the Ingleton inequality (9) for any subset of four out of the six random variables to $\Gamma\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$. We concisely write these additional inequalities in a matrix M_{I} and consider the cone

$$\Gamma^{\mathrm{I}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) := \left\{v \in \Gamma_6 \mid M_{\mathrm{CI}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)\cdot v = 0,\ M_{\mathrm{I}}\cdot v \geq 0\right\}.$$

Marginalising this cone we obtain

$$\Gamma^{\mathrm{I}}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) := \left\{w \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}} \mid M_{\mathrm{I},\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)\cdot w \geq 0\right\},$$

where $M_{\mathrm{I},\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ contains only one inequality:[23]

$$-I(X:Y:Z)\geq 0.\tag{25}$$

[23] Note that (25) makes the three Shannon inequalities of the form $I(X:Y|Z)\geq 0$ redundant. $\Gamma^{\mathrm{I}}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ is thus fully characterised by the six remaining Shannon inequalities from Example 1 and (25).

This relation can also be analytically derived from the Ingleton inequality and the conditional independence constraints of C_3^{C}. [24]

Proposition 25.

$$\Gamma^{\mathrm{I}}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \subsetneq \overline{\Gamma^{*}_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right).$$

Proof. First, we explicitly calculate the 7 extremal rays of the cone $\Gamma^{\mathrm{I}}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$. This can be done computationally and leads to the following extremal rays, which are denoted as the components of one particular vector on the ray[25]:

$$\begin{aligned}
(A) &\quad 1112222\\
(B) &\quad 0010111\\
(C) &\quad 0101011\\
(D) &\quad 1001101\\
(E) &\quad 0111111\\
(F) &\quad 1011111\\
(G) &\quad 1101111.
\end{aligned}$$

These rays can also be analytically shown to be the extremal rays of $\Gamma^{\mathrm{I}}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$.[26] For each extremal ray we show how to generate a probability distribution $P \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ whose entropy vector $v \in \overline{\Gamma^{*}_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ lies on the ray. To do so, let A, B and C be uniform random bits.

- (A): Take $X = C$, $Z = A$ and $Y = A \oplus C$ where $\oplus$ stands for addition modulus 2.
- (B): Take $Z = A$ and let $X = 1$ and $Y = 1$ deterministic. (C) and (D) are permutations of this.
- (E): Choose $Y = A = Z$ and let $X = 1$ deterministic. (F) and (G) are permutations of this.

In this way, all extremal rays of $\Gamma^{\mathrm{I}}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ are achieved by vectors in $\overline{\Gamma^{*}_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ and, by convexity of $\overline{\Gamma^{*}_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$, we have $\Gamma^{I}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \subseteq \overline{\Gamma^{*}_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$.

To show that the inclusion is strict, let A, B and C be uniform random bits. Let $X = \mathrm{AND}(B, C)$, $Y = \mathrm{AND}(A, C)$ and $Z = \mathrm{OR}(A, B)$. The marginal distribution $P_{\mathrm{XYZ}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ leads to an entropy vector $v_1 = (0.81,\ 0.81,\ 0.81,\ 1.55,\ 1.5,\ 1.5,\ 2.16)$ and an interaction information of $I(X:Y:Z) \approx 0.04 > 0$ (where all numeric values are rounded to two decimal places). Hence, $v_1 \in \overline{\Gamma^{*}_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ but $v_1 \notin \Gamma^{I}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ and therefore $\Gamma^{I}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \subsetneq \overline{\Gamma^{*}_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$. □

Proposition 25 provides a certificate for vectors to be realisable as entropy vectors in C_3^{C}: if a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^7$ obeys all Shannon constraints as well as (25), then it lies in $\overline{\Gamma^{*}_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$.

It is worth emphasising that not all correlations whose entropy vectors lie in $\Gamma^{\mathrm{I}}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ can be realised in C_3^{C}. Instead, if $\mathbf{H}(P) \in \Gamma^{\mathrm{I}}_{\mathcal{M}}$ then there exists $P' \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(C_3^{\mathrm{C}})$ such that $\mathbf{H}(P') = \mathbf{H}(P)$. The correlations realised in the scenario of Figure 5, which will be considered in detail in Section III B 1, are one such example. These are not in $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}(C_3^{\mathrm{C}})$, but their entropy vector nevertheless satisfies (25). Our argument implies that there must be another distribution realisable in the triangle causal structure with the same entropy vector.[27]

B. Quantum triangle scenario

We now turn our attention to the quantum causal structure C_3^{Q}, where the unobserved nodes A, B and C have associated subsystems A_{Y} and A_{Z}, B_{X} and B_{Z}, and, C_{X} and C_{Y} respectively. The observed variables X, Y and Z are obtained by jointly measuring the subsystems B_{X} and C_{X}, A_{Y} and C_{Y}, and, A_{Z} and B_{Z}. This is illustrated in Figure 4.

Quantum states allow for the recovery of all classical correlations but may also lead to stronger ones. In the following, we analyse this from a probabilistic as well as from an entropic perspective.

1. *Quantum correlations*

It is known that there are probability distributions of the observed variables X, Y and Z in C_3^{Q} that cannot be obtained classically [67].

Proposition 26 (Fritz)**.** *There are non-classical quantum correlations in the triangle scenario, i.e.,*

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \subsetneq \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{Q}}\right).$$

The proof of this proposition is based on the scenario illustrated in Figure 5 [67]. One can take X and Y to correspond to two bits, which we call $(\tilde{X}, \tilde{B})$ and $(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{A})$ respectively. The quantum state corresponding to node

[24] The proof proceeds as follows. There are only three instances of the Ingleton inequality that are not implied by the conditional independences and the Shannon inequalities (cf. also Proposition 21). The independence constraint $I(X:Y|C) = 0$ and its permutations $I(X:Z|B) = 0$ and $I(Y:Z|A) = 0$ lead to (25) in all three cases.

[25] As usual, we order the components as $(H(X), H(Y), H(Z), H(XY), H(XZ), H(YZ), H(XYZ))$.

[26] To do so, note that in seven dimensions seven inequalities can lead to at most seven extremal rays (choosing six of the seven to be saturated). One can then check that each of the claimed rays saturates six of the seven inequalities constraining $\Gamma^{\mathrm{I}}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$.

[27] Another such example is given by the distribution

$$P_{XYZ}(x,y,z) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{3} & (x,y,z) = (1,0,0), (0,1,0), (0,0,1) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

which is not compatible with the triangle causal structure, as shown in [75].



Figure 5. Scenario involving unobserved quantum systems, leading to a distribution which is not reproducible with classical A, B and C. In one of the cases we discuss Z is split into (A', B').

C is a maximally entangled state $\Psi_{\mathrm{C}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)$, the first half of which is the subsystem to C_X and the second half is C_Y. A and B can be taken to be uniform classical bits. We introduce $\Pi_\theta = |\theta\rangle\langle\theta|$, where $|\theta\rangle = \cos(\frac{\theta}{2})|0\rangle + \sin(\frac{\theta}{2})|1\rangle$, and the four POVMs

$$E_0 = \{\Pi_0, \Pi_\pi\} \qquad E_1 = \left\{\Pi_{\pi/2}, \Pi_{3\pi/2}\right\}$$
$$F_0 = \left\{\Pi_{\pi/4}, \Pi_{5\pi/4}\right\} \qquad F_1 = \left\{\Pi_{3\pi/4}, \Pi_{7\pi/4}\right\}.$$

Consider a measurement on the C_X subsystem with POVM E_B (i.e., if $B = 0$ then E_0 is measured and otherwise E_1), and likewise a measurement on C_Y with POVM F_A. Let us denote the corresponding outcomes $\tilde{X}$ and $\tilde{Y}$. With this choice $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{X}}\tilde{\mathrm{Y}}|\mathrm{AB}}$ violates the CHSH inequality [11]. The observed variables are then $X = (\tilde{X}, \tilde{B})$, $Y = (\tilde{Y}, \tilde{A})$ and $Z = (A', B')$, with the correlations set up such that $B' = \tilde{B} = B$ and $A' = \tilde{A} = A$.

In essence the reason that this cannot be realised in the causal structure C_3^{C} is the CHSH violation. Note though that it is also important that information about A is present in both Y and Z (and analogously for B). If for example, we consider the same scenario but with $Y = \tilde{Y}$ then we could mock-up the correlations classically. This can be done by removing A, replacing B with (B_1, B_2) and taking B_1, B_2 and C to each be a uniform random bit. We can then take $Y = C$, $Z = (B_1, B_2)$ and $X = (f(C, B_1, B_2), B_1)$, where f is chosen appropriately. Since f can depend on all of the other observed variables it can generate any correlations between them[28].

In the causal structure C_3, taking $\tilde{A} = A'$ ensures that these are shared through A and hence information about them cannot be used to generate X. However, it is natural to wonder whether all of the information about $\tilde{A}$ need be exposed at Z (and likewise for $\tilde{B}$) in order to demonstrate that correlations that can be realised in C_3^{Q} cannot be realised in C_3^{C}. In fact, this is not the case, but that at least one party can be restricted to a single output bit.

Proposition 27. *There are non-classical quantum correlations in C_3 where X and Y output two bits each while Z outputs only one.*

The proof of this proposition is based on a similar scenario as detailed above, but with $Z = \mathrm{AND}(A, B)$. It is deferred to Appendix D.

2. Quantum entropy cone

The method from Section II C can be applied to find an outer approximation $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)$ of the set of all entropy vectors compatible with C_3^{Q}. This was considered in [20], and we give a summary here for completeness. While the entropy vectors of nine random variables would correspond to elements of $\mathbb{R}^{2^9-1}$, there are only 124 well-defined entropy values in the quantum scenario that come from subsets of the following maximal coexisting sets

$$\{A_{\mathrm{Y}},\ A_{\mathrm{Z}},\ B_{\mathrm{X}},\ B_{\mathrm{Z}},\ C_{\mathrm{X}},\ C_{\mathrm{Y}}\},$$
$$\{A_{\mathrm{Y}},\ A_{\mathrm{Z}},\ B_{\mathrm{Z}},\ C_{\mathrm{Y}},\ X\},$$
$$\{A_{\mathrm{Z}},\ B_{\mathrm{X}},\ B_{\mathrm{Z}},\ C_{\mathrm{X}},\ Y\},$$
$$\{A_{\mathrm{Y}},\ B_{\mathrm{X}},\ C_{\mathrm{X}},\ C_{\mathrm{Y}},\ Z\},$$
$$\{A_{\mathrm{Z}},\ B_{\mathrm{Z}},\ X,\ Y\},$$
$$\{A_{\mathrm{Y}},\ C_{\mathrm{Y}},\ X,\ Z\},$$
$$\{B_{\mathrm{X}},\ C_{\mathrm{X}},\ Y,\ Z\},$$
$$\{X,\ Y,\ Z\}.$$

Within the coexisting sets, the von Neumann inequalities, submodularity and weak monotonicity, always hold. Since X, Y and Z are random variables, their entropy conditioned on a quantum state as well as the entropy of a quantum state conditioned on these variables is non-negative, monotonicity holds for them. In combination with the independence of the three sources this implies that only within the pairs $(A_{\mathrm{Y}}, A_{\mathrm{Z}})$, $(B_{\mathrm{X}}, B_{\mathrm{Z}})$ and $(C_{\mathrm{X}}, C_{\mathrm{Y}})$ do we have to consider weak monotonicity instead of monotonicity, as there can be entanglement between these subsystems. All these basic inequalities are then assembled in a matrix $M_{\mathrm{B}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)$.

The variables within the different coexisting sets are related by means of data processing inequalities, introduced in Proposition 19. All instances of the DPI can be added to the scenario using a matrix $M_{\mathrm{DPI}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)$. Many of the inequalities are implied by others due to the conditional independences explained below. Intuitively, we can view the coexisting sets as representing the different stages of the system, starting out in a product state $\rho_{\mathrm{ABC}} = \rho_{\mathrm{A_Y A_Z}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{B_X B_Z}} \otimes \rho_{\mathrm{C_X C_Y}}$, where the parties X, Y and Z then obtain respective subsystems and perform their measurements on their two input states in any order. The data processing inequalities connect the systems at the different stages of this process, before and after the

[28] This is like playing the CHSH game but where Alice knows Bob's input and output in addition to her own.

individual measurements. They supplement the Shannon and von Neumann inequalities.

The conditional independence relations complement this set of inequalities with a matrix $M_{\mathrm{QCI}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)$. According to Observation 1 from Section II C 3,

$$I(A_{\mathrm{Y}}A_{\mathrm{Z}} : B_{\mathrm{X}}B_{\mathrm{Z}}C_{\mathrm{X}}C_{\mathrm{Y}}) = 0 \tag{26}$$

holds. The same is true for permutations of the pairs of variables shared by each source. These constraints also imply independences among the corresponding subsets of variables[29]. Moreover, the independence of the three sources, represented by (26) and its permutations, and the DPI imply all further independencies in the causal structure, among them are the following three equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} I(A_{\mathrm{Y}}A_{\mathrm{Z}} : B_{\mathrm{Z}}C_{\mathrm{Y}}X) &= 0, \\ I(B_{\mathrm{X}}B_{\mathrm{Z}} : A_{\mathrm{Z}}C_{\mathrm{X}}Y) &= 0, \\ I(C_{\mathrm{X}}C_{\mathrm{Y}} : A_{\mathrm{Y}}B_{\mathrm{X}}Z) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Other (implied) equalities can be derived from these.

The usual Fourier-Motzkin algorithm can then be used to eliminate the unobserved subsystems and give an outer approximation to the set of achievable entropy vectors in the marginal scenario. We remark that before running this algorithm we can use equality constraints to eliminate variables and reduce the dimensionality. We can also take $\rho_{\mathrm{A_Y A_Z}}$, $\rho_{\mathrm{B_X B_Z}}$ and $\rho_{\mathrm{C_X C_Y}}$ to be pure to remove six further variables.

This procedure leads to an approximation $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)$ of the set of entropy vectors of the observed variables. It is given by the Shannon inequalities (4) and (5) for the jointly distributed X, Y and Z and the additional inequality (15) including permutations of X, Y and Z [20].

It is natural to ask whether tighter approximations can be realised by using a procedure analogous to the one that led to tighter approximations in the classical case. Unfortunately, we don't know of any non-von Neumann inequalities for multi-party quantum states. Furthermore, even if the known non-Shannon inequalities were to hold for von Neumann entropy we would not be able to use them to add constraints to C_3^{Q} because there are not enough interdependent variables within the coexisting sets.

Open Problem 28. *Do the closures of the classical and the quantum marginal entropy cones coincide in the triangle scenario, i.e., does* $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) = \overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)$ *hold?*

We will return to this open problem in Section IV B.

[29] Note that for three sets of variables X, Y and Z the inequality $I(X : YZ) = I(X : Y|Z) + I(X : Z)$ holds. Due to the positivity of the mutual information and the conditional mutual information $I(X : YZ) = 0$ also implies $I(X : Z) = 0$.

C. Hybrid causal structures for C_3

In some situations we may have reason to assume that particular unobserved nodes are classical, while others are quantum. For instance, since sharing entanglement over large distances is extremely challenging due to noise, we might assume that two observations that are taken far apart do not have joint quantum causes.

In the case of the causal structure C_3, there are two such hybrid scenarios: either one or two of the three unobserved variables can be chosen to be classical, whereas the others are quantum. We call these two causal structures C_3^{CQQ} and C_3^{CCQ} respectively. In the following, we will approximate the entropy cones for both scenarios.

1. C_3^{CQQ} scenario

In this scenario one of the unobserved variables is classical, which we take to be A. The previously introduced methods allow us to compute approximations of the set of allowed entropy vectors. Interestingly we find

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{CQQ}}\right) = \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{Q}}\right).$$

Note that no non-Shannon constraints are used as the input to the algorithm generating $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{CQQ}}\right)$. However, unlike the fully quantum case C_3^{Q}, non-Shannon constraints can be legitimately included. In particular, the inequality of Proposition 3 with the variable choices

$$\Diamond_{YZAX} \geq 0, \quad \Diamond_{YZXA} \geq 0$$

can be included. This results in a tighter approximation than $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{CQQ}}\right)$. This tighter approximation comprises the Shannon inequalities for three variables, the constraint of (15) and[30]

$$\begin{aligned} &-3H(X) - 3H(Y) - 3H(Z) + 2H(XY) \\ &\qquad + 2H(XZ) + 3H(YZ) - H(XYZ) \geq 0, \\ &-2H(X) - 2H(Y) - 2H(Z) + 3H(XY) \\ &\qquad + 3H(XZ) + 3H(YZ) - 4H(XYZ) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Further non-Shannon constraints could also be exploited to give a tighter approximation still.

2. C_3^{CCQ} scenario

In this scenario we take A and B to be classical. To approximate the marginal entropy cone of this scenario, $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{CCQ}}\right)$, we proceed analogously to the C_3^{Q}

[30] The second of these inequalities can be easily derived from $\Diamond_{YZXA} \geq 0$ and the conditional independences, analogously to Lemma 23. To derive the first inequality, on the other hand, several inequalities have to be combined.

and C_3^{CQQ} scenarios before. However, the result differs and leads to a tighter cone

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{CCQ}}\right) \subsetneq \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{CQQ}}\right).$$

It is given by the three variable Shannon inequalities and the following additional constraints:

$$\begin{aligned} &-H(X)-H(Y)-H(Z)+H(XY)+H(XZ)\geq 0,\\ &-3H(X)-3H(Y)-3H(Z)+2H(XY)\\ &\qquad +3H(XZ)+2H(YZ)-H(XYZ)\geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

up to permutations of X, Y and Z in the first inequality and of Y and Z in the second. Note that these five inequalities are a subset of the seven inequalities (19) delimiting $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ and

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \subsetneq \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{CCQ}}\right).$$

The inequalities

$$\diamondsuit_{XZBY}\geq 0, \quad \diamondsuit_{YZAX}\geq 0, \quad \diamondsuit_{YZXA}\geq 0,$$

lead to the additional constraints

$$\begin{aligned} &-2H(X)-2H(Y)-2H(Z)+3H(XY)+3H(XZ)+3H(YZ)-4H(XYZ)\geq 0,\\ &-6H(X)-6H(Y)-6H(Z)+5H(XY)+5H(XZ)+5H(YZ)-3H(XYZ)\geq 0,\\ &-4H(X)-4H(Y)-4H(Z)+3H(XY)+4H(XZ)+3H(YZ)-2H(XYZ)\geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

up to permutations of X and Y in the last inequality. They render the second inequalities in (27) redundant, while the first remains (for all of its permutations). Note that the first inequality of (28) is present in $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{CQQ}}\right)$.

Further constraints could also be derived by considering additional non-Shannon inequalities.

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE ENTROPY VECTOR APPROACH

In this section, we further discuss use of the entropy vector approach for distinguishing between the quantum and classical versions of a given causal structure. In Section IV A we analyse further causal structures and point out the relevance of non-Shannon inequalities for most of them. Difficulties similar to the case of C_3 are encountered. Furthermore, in Section IV B, we discuss Open Problem 28 in more detail.

A. Probabilistically "interesting" causal structures

The concept of a generalised DAG was introduced in [56], the idea being to have one framework in which classical, quantum and even more general systems can be shared by unobserved nodes. For the full details of this framework, we refer to the original paper. The part that is of interest here is that the authors considered all generalised DAGs with up to six nodes and excluded the set for which they could establish that there is no separation between $\mathcal{P}(C^{\mathrm{C}})$ and $\mathcal{P}(C^{\mathrm{Q}})$. This left 21 potentially "interesting" causal structures. We investigate these from an entropic perspective, looking for a causal structure



Figure 6. Three causal structures for which the outer approximation of the entropic marginal cone coincides with the closure of the classical entropy cone. The observed variables are labelled W, X, Y and Z, the unobserved nodes are called A and B.

C in which there is a separation between $\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ and $\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)$.

Among these structures there are three that have fewer than six nodes, displayed in Figure 6. Note that, in contrast to the two-generation causal structures we discussed previously, these involve edges between observed variables. One important property of a generalised DAG (G-DAG) is that only classical information can be transmitted via such a link and, in particular, no additional unobserved system. For instance in Figure 6(a), the node Z receives only the observed output Y from its observed parent and no additional system can be forwarded from X through the node Y to Z. This means that more general causal links are possible than those allowed by a G-DAG. However, the restriction is introduced in order to get a Markov condition in these generalised networks.[31]

In all three causal structures of Figure 6, we find that the vertices of the corresponding Shannon cone,

[31] In some situations the assumption that no unobserved influence propagates in addition to the observed variable may not be natural.

$\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}(C^{\mathrm{C}})$, are achievable with entropy vectors of classical probability distributions compatible with the causal structure, from which it follows that this cone is equal to $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}(C^{\mathrm{C}})$, the closure of the classical marginal entropy cone. Thus, the consideration of non-Shannon inequalities cannot lead to any further insight in these scenarios. By constructing outer approximations to the quantum entropy cones with the method outlined in Section II C, we also find that the latter cones also coincide with $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}(C^{\mathrm{C}})$ (as had already been shown for the causal structure of Figure 6(b) in [76]). Hence, for causal structures with (strictly) fewer than six variables the entropy vector method is unable to detect any classical to quantum separation.

The 18 remaining causal structures involve six nodes. For all of them we observe that several instances of the inequality of Proposition 3 lead to tighter entropic constraints for the classical marginal scenarios than the ones already listed in [56].

Note that for the scenarios with four observed variables, instances of this inequality are relevant even without considering the unobserved nodes. These instances thus hold whether or not the unobserved nodes are classical or quantum. Hence, they allow us to tighten the outer approximation of the entropic cones in both cases, in contrast to non-Shannon inequalities involving unobserved variables (which are not known to hold in the quantum case).[32]

Overall, the above considerations have not enabled us to show a separation between the achievable entropy vectors in the classical and quantum cases.

Open Problem 29. *Find a causal structure C with a set of observed nodes $\mathcal{M}$ in which the sets $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}(C^{\mathrm{C}})$ and $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}(C^{\mathrm{Q}})$ are provably different, or show that this can never occur.*

B. Further discussion of Open Problem 28

One way to solve this problem would be by finding an entropy vector obtained in the quantum causal structure that lies outside one of our approximations to $\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$. Random searches where the sources A, B and C distribute up to four qubits each did not detect violations of any of our inequalities. However, the evidence from these random searches against a separation of the classical and the quantum marginal cones is relatively weak: vectors that lie in $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)$ but not in $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ necessarily violate (25), i.e., they lie outside the inner approximation $\Gamma^{\mathrm{I}}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ to the classical marginal cone. In fact, random searches were unable to find such vectors (although we know they exist). This illustrates the weakness of this method, and shows that the region we are looking for (if it even exists) is very small.

We have also considered particular scenarios and games involving entangled states, for which we know that there is distinctive quantum behaviour (i.e., a separation at the level of correlations). Intuitively such scenarios should be good candidates to exhibit violations of the classical entropic bounds. However, somewhat surprisingly, we have not been able to find any.

For example, the entropy vector corresponding to the CHSH correlations detailed in the text following Proposition 26 is a natural candidate, but this lies inside $\Gamma^{I}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ so is classically reproducible. This particular distribution is also achievable in the causal structure P_4 (a causal structure equivalent to the one in Figure 6(b)). Any distribution compatible with P_4 may be realised in C_3, by choosing one of the variables, e.g. Z, to have two outputs, one depending only on the input from node A and the other one depending on the input from B. Distributions realisable in P_4^{Q} or P_4^{C} are thus always realisable in C_3^{Q} or C_3^{C} respectively. According to the results of [76], all entropy vectors realised with distributions in P_4^{Q} are also classically achievable, i.e., realisable in P_4^{C} (at least asymptotically). Hence, no distribution in P_4^{Q} may ever violate any of the classical entropic inequalities valid for C_3^{C}. The only way of violating the entropic constraints to $\overline{\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ is therefore by processing the inputs to all three nodes X, Y and Z, so as to get around the results from [76].[33]

In the particular example above, we have therefore taken Z to be a function of A and B. We have additionally considered local processing of X and Y. However, even after such post-processing, for instance by applying all possible functions from two to one bits, we have not been able to detect any violations of the classical entropic bounds.

Note that vectors outside $\Gamma^{I}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ can be constructed with appropriate post-processing of the (quantum) distribution. A possible way to achieve this is applying AND or OR functions appropriately. One may for instance consider the quantum scenario detailed in Section III B 1, and take $X = \mathrm{AND}(\tilde{X}, \tilde{B})$, $Y = \mathrm{AND}(\tilde{Y}, \tilde{A})$ and $Z = \mathrm{OR}(A', B')$. This renders the interaction information of the entropy vector of the joint distribution of X, Y and Z positive, which is not the case without applying the functions.

We have considered further distributions in $\mathcal{P}(C_3^{\mathrm{Q}})$, ensuring that they do not lie in P_4^{Q}. These include input states and measurements known to lead to violations of the chained Bell inequalities [12] or the Mermin-Peres

[32] Note that this reasoning is not restricted to distinguishing classical and quantum, but, it may also apply to the comparison of different causal structures with the same set of observed variables. While non-Shannon inequalities derived from latent variables may lead to a separation between the two causal structures, non-Shannon inequalities valid only for the observed variables may not.

[33] Two distributions that share the same entropy vector can be very different and hence may be separated by local processing.

magic square game [77, 78]. We have also considered scenarios where all three parties measure entangled states and use the measurement outputs as inputs for further measurements. We have furthermore attempted to incorporate functions known to lead to a positive interaction information in the classical case, as well as functions from two to one bit in general, into these scenarios. None of these attempts has lead to a violation of the classical inequalities so far. In a number of scenarios we have also considered shared PR-boxes instead of entangled states, again without detecting any violations of the inequalities. In most cases the corresponding entropy vectors have a negative interaction information, and hence lie in $\Gamma^{\mathrm{I}}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$, so can be realised with a classical distribution as well, like in the case of the correlations discussed at the end of Section III A 5.

V. CONCLUSIONS

While the entropy vector approach outlined here is a useful means for distinguishing different causal structures, as was illustrated in Section III, its ability to differentiate between classical and quantum versions of the same causal structure is limited. Such a limitation was previously found in [76], where it was shown that for the class of causal structures P_n the entropy vector approach fails to detect such a separation. In this work, we have extended the considerations there to other causal structures, which has unveiled further limitations of the approach.

Non-Shannon inequalities are found to be important for settling the question of whether there is ever a distinction between the entropy vectors of classical and quantum causal structures. They allow us to tighten the entropic approximations of the classical entropic cones in many causal structures including the triangle scenario.[34] These new constraints also improve the entropic distinction of different classical causal structures, which is of interest for (classical) causal inference.

The structure of entropy space is relatively poorly understood. Even in the absence of a causal structure we lack a tight characterisation that allows us to separate the allowed entropy vectors from those that cannot be realised. In the quantum case, it is an important open problem whether any non-von Neumann constraints exist. This partly explains why we are unable to rule out that there is some causal structure in which the described entropy vector approach can be useful for distinguishing classical and quantum.

There are other techniques relying on entropy, which are known to lead to inequalities that can be violated with probability distributions generated by measuring quantum systems [12, 16, 18]. These methods consider the entropies of a subset of the observed variables, called *outputs* here, conditioned on the values of other observed variables, thought of as *inputs*. In some cases the form of the causal structure means that in the classical case it makes sense to consider a joint distribution of the output variables for different inputs (generalising Fine's theorem [79, 80]), which allows for a derivation of entropic inequalities [12, 16, 18]. The latter may not hold in the quantum case because there is no such joint distribution there. A more detailed explanation of this method in the terminology and notation of the present paper can be found in [76]. Note that non-Shannon inequalities could be applied in combination with this technique and may lead to new inequalities there.

The applicability of the above method is, however, also limited. Firstly, increasing the dimensionality of the inputs, the derivation of inequalities may quickly become infeasible. Secondly, and more importantly, treating certain variables as inputs and taking them to be jointly distributed may often not be justified. For instance, in the triangle causal structure it is not clear why one should consider, e.g., X as an input to Y and Z, and, whether it is possible to define an overall distribution whose marginals are the joint distributions of Y and Z conditioned on different X-values[35].

The above issues raise the open question, of whether there is a novel technique that allows for an efficient and accurate way to distinguish classical and quantum versions of the same causal structure. Such a technique needs to simplify the description of the set of allowed distributions but remain complex enough to retain the distinctive features of classical, quantum and post-quantum probability distributions. Identifying such a quantity would provide further insight into the meaning of cause in quantum mechanics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Benjamin Chapman and Alex May for their assistance with initial investigations, and we thank Luke Elliott for carrying out random searches in Fortran. We are grateful to Matthew Pusey for alerting us to an error in an earlier draft. RC is partly supported by the EPSRC's Quantum Communications Hub.

[34] In the case of the triangle scenario this is somewhat surprising, because there are only three observed variables. Without the independence constraints, which "select" a certain part of the boundary of the entropic cone before its projection, the entropic cone would not need any non-Shannon inequalities for its characterisation.

[35] In order to apply the technique additional observed input variables could be introduced, but these would lead to a different causal structure.

[1] Bell, J. S. On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox. *Physics* **1**, 195–200 (1964).

[2] Ekert, A. K. Quantum cryptography based on Bell's theorem. *Physical review letters* **67**, 661–663 (1991).

[3] Mayers, D. & Yao, A. Quantum cryptography with imperfect apparatus. In *Proceedings of the 39th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS-98)*, 503–509 (IEEE Computer Society, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 1998).

[4] Barrett, J., Hardy, L. & Kent, A. No signaling and quantum key distribution. *Physical review letters* **95**, 010503 (2005).

[5] Acín, A., Gisin, N. & Masanes, L. From Bell's theorem to secure quantum key distribution. *Physical review letters* **97**, 120405 (2006).

[6] Vazirani, U. & Vidick, T. Fully device-independent quantum key distribution. *Physical review letters* **113**, 140501 (2014).

[7] Colbeck, R. *Quantum and Relativistic Protocols For Secure Multi-Party Computation*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge (2007). Also available as arXiv:0911.3814.

[8] Pironio, S. *et al.* Random numbers certified by Bell's theorem. *Nature* **464**, 1021–1024 (2010).

[9] Colbeck, R. & Kent, A. Private randomness expansion with untrusted devices. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **44**, 095305 (2011).

[10] Miller, C. A. & Shi, Y. Universal security for randomness expansion from the spot-checking protocol. e-print arXiv:1411.6608 (2014).

[11] Clauser, J. F., Horne, M. A., Shimony, A. & Holt, R. A. Proposed Experiment to Test Local Hidden-Variable Theories. *Physical Review Letters* **23**, 880–884 (1969).

[12] Braunstein, S. L. & Caves, C. M. Information-Theoretic Bell Inequalities. *Physical Review Letters* **61**, 662–665 (1988).

[13] Greenberger, D. M., Horne, M. & Zeilinger, A. Going beyond Bell's theorem. In Kafatos, M. (ed.) *Bell's Theorem, Quantum Mechanics and Conceptions of the Universe*, 69–72 (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 1989).

[14] Cerf, N. J. & Adami, C. Entropic Bell inequalities. *Physical Review A* **55**, 3371–3374 (1997).

[15] Collins, D., Gisin, N., Linden, N., Massar, S. & Popescu, S. Bell inequalities for arbitrarily high-dimensional systems. *Physical review letters* **88**, 040404 (2002).

[16] Chaves, R. & Fritz, T. Entropic approach to local realism and noncontextuality. *Physical Review A* **85**, 032113 (2012).

[17] Chaves, R. Entropic inequalities as a necessary and sufficient condition to noncontextuality and locality. *Physical Review A* **87**, 022102 (2013).

[18] Fritz, T. & Chaves, R. Entropic Inequalities and Marginal Problems. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **59**, 803–817 (2013).

[19] Chaves, R., Luft, L. & Gross, D. Causal structures from entropic information: geometry and novel scenarios. *New Journal of Physics* **16**, 043001 (2014).

[20] Chaves, R., Majenz, C. & Gross, D. Information-theoretic implications of quantum causal structures. *Nature communications* **6**, 5766 (2015).

[21] Steudel, B. & Ay, N. Information-Theoretic Inference of Common Ancestors. *Entropy* **17**, 2304–2327 (2015).

[22] Chaves, R. & Budroni, C. Entropic nonsignalling correlations. e-print arXiv:1601.07555 (2016).

[23] Shannon, C. E. A Mathematical Theory of Communication. *Bell System Technical Journal* **27**, 379–423 (1948).

[24] McGill, W. J. Multivariate information transmission. *Psychometrika* **19**, 97–116 (1954).

[25] Zhang, Z. & Yeung, R. W. A non-Shannon-type conditional inequality of information quantities. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **43**, 1982–1986 (1997).

[26] Yeung, R. A framework for linear information inequalities. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **43**, 1924–1934 (1997).

[27] Han, T.-S. A uniqueness of Shannon's information distance and related non-negativity problems. *Journal of Combinatorics, Information & System Sciences* **6**, 320–321 (1981).

[28] Zhang, Z. & Yeung, R. W. On characterization of entropy function via information inequalities. In *Information Theory, 1998. Proceedings. 1998 IEEE International Symposium on*, 375 (IEEE, 1998).

[29] Matus, F. Infinitely Many Information Inequalities. In *2007 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 41–44 (IEEE, 2007).

[30] Weidong Xu, Jia Wang & Jun Sun. A projection method for derivation of non-Shannon-type information inequalities. In *2008 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 2116–2120 (IEEE, 2008).

[31] Dougherty, R., Freiling, C. & Zeger, K. Non-Shannon Information Inequalities in Four Random Variables. e-print arXiv:1104.3602 (2011).

[32] Makarychev, K., Makarychev, Y., Romashchenko, A. & Vereshchagin, N. A new class of non-Shannon-type inequalities for entropies. *Communications in Information and Systems* **2**, 147–166 (2002).

[33] Dougherty, R., Freiling, C. & Zeger, K. Six New Non-Shannon Information Inequalities. In *2006 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 233–236 (IEEE, 2006).

[34] Ingleton, A. W. Representation of Matroids. In Welsh, D. J. A. (ed.) *Combinatorial Mathematics and its applications*, 149–167 (Academic Press, 1971).

[35] Matúš, F. & Studeny, M. Conditional Independences among four random variables I. *Combinatorics, Probability & Computing* **4**, 269–278 (1995).

[36] Zhang, Z. & Yang, J. On a new non-Shannon-type information inequality. In *Proceedings IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 235 (IEEE, 2002).

[37] Pippenger, N. The inequalities of quantum information theory. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **49**, 773–789 (2003).

[38] Lieb, E. H. Proof of the strong subadditivity of quantum-mechanical entropy. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **14**, 1938 (1973).

[39] Araki, H. & Lieb, E. H. Entropy inequalities. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **18**, 160–170 (1970).

[40] Linden, N. & Winter, A. A New Inequality for the von Neumann Entropy. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **259**, 129–138 (2005).

[41] Cadney, J., Linden, N. & Winter, A. Infinitely Many Constrained Inequalities for the von Neumann Entropy. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **58**, 3657–3663 (2012).

[42] Linden, N., Matus, F., Ruskai, M. B. & Winter, A. The Quantum Entropy Cone of Stabiliser States. In *LIPIcs - Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics*, vol. 22, 284 (Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2013).

[43] Gross, D. & Walter, M. Stabilizer information inequalities from phase space distributions. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **54**, 082201 (2013).

[44] Shor, P. W. Scheme for reducing decoherence in quantum computer memory. *Physical Review A* **52**, R2493–R2496 (1995).

[45] Gottesman, D. The Heisenberg Representation of Quantum Computers. In *Proceedings of the XXII International Colloquium on Group Theoretical Methods in Physics*, 20 (1998).

[46] Colbeck, R. & Renner, R. A system's wave function is uniquely determined by its underlying physical state. e-print arXiv:1312.7353 (2013).

[47] Colbeck, R. & Renner, R. The completeness of quantum theory for predicting measurement outcomes. In Chiribella, G. & Spekkens, R. W. (eds.) *Quantum Theory: Informational Foundations and Foils*, 497–528 (Springer, 2016).

[48] Spirtes, P., Glymour, C. N. & Scheines, R. *Causation, Prediction, and Search* (MIT Press, 2000).

[49] Pearl, J. *Causality: Models, Reasoning, and Inference*, vol. 2nd (Cambridge University Press, 2009).

[50] Verma, T. & Pearl, J. Causal networks: semantics and expressiveness. *Proceedings of the 4th workshop on uncertainty in artificial intelligence (2013)* 352–359 (1990).

[51] Wood, C. J. & Spekkens, R. W. The lesson of causal discovery algorithms for quantum correlations: causal explanations of Bell-inequality violations require fine-tuning. *New Journal of Physics* **17**, 033002 (2015).

[52] Williams, H. P. Fourier's method of linear programming and its dual. *The American Mathematical Monthly* **93**, 681–695 (1986).

[53] Fritz, T. Beyond Bell's Theorem II: Scenarios with Arbitrary Causal Structure. *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **341**, 391–434 (2015).

[54] Tsirelson, B. Some results and problems on quantum Bell-type inequalities. *Hadronic Journal Supplement* **8**, 329–345 (1993).

[55] Rohrlich, D. & Popescu, S. Nonlocality as an axiom for quantum theory. *Foundations of Physics* **24**, 379–385 (1995).

[56] Henson, J., Lal, R. & Pusey, M. F. Theory-independent limits on correlations from generalized Bayesian networks. *New Journal of Physics* **16**, 113043 (2014).

[57] Pienaar, J. & Brukner, Č. A graph-separation theorem for quantum causal models. *New Journal of Physics* **17**, 073020 (2015).

[58] Leifer, M. S. & Spekkens, R. W. Towards a formulation of quantum theory as a causally neutral theory of Bayesian inference. *Physical Review A* **88**, 052130 (2013).

[59] Cerf, N. J. & Adami, C. Quantum extension of conditional probability. *Physical Review A* **60**, 893–897 (1999).

[60] Nielsen, M. A. & Chuang, I. L. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2000).

[61] Rosset, D. *et al.* Nonlinear Bell Inequalities Tailored for Quantum Networks. *Physical Review Letters* **116**, 010403 (2016).

[62] Chaves, R. Polynomial Bell Inequalities. *Physical Review Letters* **116**, 010402 (2016).

[63] Lee, C. M. & Spekkens, R. W. Causal inference via algebraic geometry: necessary and sufficient conditions for the feasibility of discrete causal models. e-print arXiv:1506.03880 (2015).

[64] Pitowsky, I. Correlation polytopes: Their geometry and complexity. *Mathematical Programming* **50**, 395–414 (1991).

[65] Avis, D., Imai, H., Ito, T. & Sasaki, Y. Deriving Tight Bell Inequalities for 2 Parties with Many 2-valued Observables from Facets of Cut Polytopes. e-print arXiv:quant-ph/0404014 (2004).

[66] Costa, F. & Shrapnel, S. Quantum causal modelling. e-print arXiv:1512.07106 (2015).

[67] Fritz, T. Beyond Bell's theorem: correlation scenarios. *New Journal of Physics* **14**, 103001 (2012).

[68] Branciard, C., Rosset, D., Gisin, N. & Pironio, S. Bilocal versus nonbilocal correlations in entanglement-swapping experiments. *Physical Review A* **85**, 032119 (2012).

[69] Christof, T. & Loebel, A. POlyhedron Representation Transformation Algorithm (PORTA) (1997). URL http://comopt.ifi.uni-heidelberg.de/software/PORTA/index.html.

[70] Chernikov, S. N. Contraction of systems of linear inequalities. *Soviet mathematics Doklady* **1** (1960).

[71] Chernikov, S. N. The convolution of finite systems of linear inequalities. *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics* **5**, 1–24 (1965).

[72] Bastrakov, S. I. & Zolotykh, N. Y. Fast method for verifying Chernikov rules in Fourier-Motzkin elimination. *Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics* **55**, 160–167 (2015).

[73] Monniaux, D. *Computer Aided Verification: 22nd International Conference, CAV 2010, Edinburgh, UK, July 15-19, 2010. Proceedings*, chap. Quantifier Elimination by Lazy Model Enumeration, 585–599 (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010).

[74] Weilenmann, M. & Colbeck, R. Available at: http://www-users.york.ac.uk/~rc973/triangle.html.

[75] Wolfe, E., Spekkens, R. W. & Fritz, T. In preparation.

[76] Weilenmann, M. & Colbeck, R. The entropy vector method is unable to certify non-classicality in line-like causal structures. e-print arXiv:1603.02553 (2016).

[77] Mermin, N. D. Simple unified form for the major no-hidden-variables theorems. *Physical Review Letters* **65**, 3373–3376 (1990).

[78] Peres, A. Incompatible results of quantum measurements. *Physics Letters A* **151**, 107–108 (1990).

[79] Fine, A. Joint distributions, quantum correlations, and commuting observables. *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **23**, 1306 (1982).

[80] Fine, A. Hidden Variables, Joint Probability, and the Bell Inequalities. *Physical Review Letters* **48**, 291–295 (1982).

Appendix A: Further non-Shannon entropic inequalities

1. Copy lemma

The systematic search for non-Shannon inequalities of four random variables from [31] is based on the following so-called copy lemma.

Lemma 30 (Dougherty, Freiling & Zeger)**.** *Let T, U, V and W be jointly distributed random variables. Then there exists a random variable R, jointly distributed with T, U, V and W, that obeys the following conditions:*

- *The marginal distributions of (T, U, V) and (T, U, R) are the same.*
- $I(VW : R|TU) = 0$.

New information inequalities are generated by adding auxiliary variables with these properties to the set of random variables one is actually interested in. By applying known inequalities as well as the previous lemma to this larger set of random variables one can recover an inequality only containing the original variables. For these inequalities it is easy to check, e.g., by means of a linear program, whether or not they are implied by the Shannon constraints.

Using up to four auxiliary variables and three instances of the copy lemma they found 214 additional inequalities, listed in Section VIII of [31]. They also derived rules to extend their entropic inequalities to infinite families of inequalities similar to the ones found by Matúš [29]. This procedure can in principle be repeated using more auxiliary variables and more instances of the copy lemma until the computational resources become prohibitive.

It turns out that all the non-redundant inequalities derived in [31] are of the form

$$\begin{aligned} aI(T:U) \leq\, & bI(T:U|V) + cI(T:V|U) + dI(U:V|T) \\ & + eI(T:U|W) + fI(T:W|U) + gI(U:W|T) \\ & + hI(V:W) + iI(V:W|T) \end{aligned}$$

with positive coefficients a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h and i. The coefficient a is furthermore such that they comply with the requirements of Proposition 21, i.e., they can be written as the Ingleton inequality (9) supplemented with conditional mutual information terms, as was mentioned in Section II A.

With one instance of the copy lemma, the authors of [31] recover the inequality from Proposition 3, with two instances they recover the following six inequalities for four random variables T, U, V and W [33]:

$$\begin{aligned} -3H(T) - 5H(U) - 3H(V) + 8H(TU) \\ +6H(TV) - 2H(TW) + 6H(UV) + 2H(UW) \\ +2H(VW) - 9H(TUV) - 2H(UVW) \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{A1}$$

$$\begin{aligned} -5H(T) - 3H(U) - 2H(V) - H(W) + 6H(TU) \\ +6H(TV) - 4H(TW) + 5H(UV) + 3H(UW) \\ -2H(VW) - 7H(TUV) - 4H(TUW) \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} -7H(T) - 2H(U) - 4H(V) + 8H(TU) \\ +9H(TV) + 3H(TW) + 5H(UV) - 2H(UW) \\ +3H(VW) - 9H(TUV) - 4H(TVW) \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

$$\begin{aligned} -H(T) - 5H(U) - 5H(V) + 6H(TU) + 6H(TV) \\ -2H(TW) + 8H(UV) + 2H(UW) + 2H(VW) \\ -9H(TUV) - 2H(UVW) \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{A4}$$

$$\begin{aligned} -H(T) - 7H(U) - 4H(V) - H(W) + 7H(TU) \\ +5H(TV) - 2H(TW) + 9H(UV) + 4H(UW) \\ +3H(VW) - 9H(TUV) - 4H(UVW) \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{A5}$$

$$\begin{aligned} -5H(T) - 5H(U) - H(V) + 8H(TU) + 5H(TV) \\ +3H(TW) + 5H(UV) + 3H(UW) - 2H(VW) \\ -7H(TUV) - 4H(TUW) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{A6}$$

2. Inequalities for five and six random variables

For more than four variables the following inequalities are known.

Proposition 31 (Zhang & Yeung [28])**.** *For $n+2$ discrete random variables T, U, $V_1, \ldots V_n$ and for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ the following inequality holds*

$$\begin{aligned} n \cdot I(T:U) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} I(T:U|V_j) - n \cdot I(T:U|V_i) \\ \leq I(V_i : TU) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} H(V_j) - H(V_1 \ \ldots \ V_n). \end{aligned}$$

Note that Proposition 31 is a generalisation of Proposition 3.

Proposition 32 (Makarychev et al. [32])**.** *For $n+3$ discrete random variables T, U, V, $W_1, \ldots, W_n$ the following inequality holds*

$$\begin{aligned} H(W_1 \ \ldots \ W_n) + n \cdot I(T:U:V) - I(TU:V) \\ \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n} I(T:U|W_j) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} H(W_j). \end{aligned}$$

Appendix B: Proof of Lemma 14

For the causal structure C^{C}, let

$$E\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{2^n-1} \mid \exists P = \prod_{i=1}^{n} P_{\mathrm{X_i}|\mathrm{X_i^{\downarrow 1}}} \in \mathcal{P}_n \text{ s.t. } v = \mathbf{H}(P) \right\}$$

be the set of all entropy vectors. Since (13) holds for each variable X_i if and only if $P = \prod_{i=1}^{n} P_{\mathrm{X_i}|\mathrm{X_i^{\downarrow 1}}}$ (cf. Proposition 12), the set $E\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ can be rewritten as

$$E\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) = \left\{ v \in \Gamma_n^* \mid \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\},\ I(X_i : X_i^{\ddagger} | X_i^{\downarrow 1}) = 0 \right\}.$$

Applying the definition of $M_{\mathrm{CI}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ yields $E\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) = \Gamma^*\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$. Now, let us consider the set

$$F(C^{\mathrm{C}}) := \left\{ v \in \overline{\Gamma_n^*} \mid M_{\mathrm{CI}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \cdot v = 0 \right\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{2^n-1}.$$

This is a closed convex set, since $\overline{\Gamma_n^*}$ is known to be closed and convex and since restricting the closed convex cone $\overline{\Gamma_n^*}$ with linear equality constraints retains these properties. More precisely, the set of solutions to the matrix equality $M_{\mathrm{CI}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \cdot v = 0$ is also closed and convex. As it is the intersection of two closed convex sets, the set $F(C^{\mathrm{C}})$ is also closed and convex[36]. From this we conclude that $\overline{\Gamma^*}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ is convex, as

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\Gamma^*}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) &= \overline{\{v \in \Gamma_n^* \mid M_{\mathrm{CI}}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \cdot v = 0\}} \\ &= F(C^{\mathrm{C}}). \end{aligned}$$

To see this, note that as $F(C^{\mathrm{C}})$ is closed, any element $w \in F(C^{\mathrm{C}})$, in particular any element on its boundary, can be obtained as the limit of a sequence of elements $\{w_k\}_k$ for $k \to \infty$, where the w_k lie in the interior of $F(C^{\mathrm{C}})$ for all k. Hence $w \in \overline{\Gamma^*}\left(C^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$[37]. □

Appendix C: Previous work

Our Proposition 22 contradicts the claim in [19, 20] that the entropy cone, $\overline{\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}^*}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$, of the triangle causal structure coincides with the corresponding outer approximation, $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}(C_3^{\mathrm{C}})$. We review these results and explain the discrepancy.

In [19, 20], the inequalities defining the set $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ as well as its vertex description were calculated. Furthermore, probability distributions $P \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}$ that achieve the rays of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ are presented in the Supplementary Information of [20]. This shows

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \subseteq \overline{\Gamma_3^*}, \tag{C1}$$

i.e., all vectors $v \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ can be written as the entropy of a valid probability distribution (but not necessarily one that is achievable in the triangle causal structure), at least asymptotically.

If the set $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}^*\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ could be written as

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}^*\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) = \left\{ v \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}^* \mid M_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \cdot v \geq 0 \right\}, \tag{C2}$$

then $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}^*\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) = \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \cap \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}^*$ would hold and (C1) would be sufficient to prove $\overline{\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}^*}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) = \Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$.

However, we have observed that $\overline{\Gamma^*}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ is constrained by many additional inequalities as compared to $\Gamma\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$. Variable elimination has allowed us to derive tighter inequalities supplementing the ones contained in $M_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$. In Proposition 22, we have noticed that according to our tightened description of the triangle scenario, one of the rays of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ does not lie within the $\overline{\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}^*}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ and we have proven that $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \neq \overline{\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}^*}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$. Hence, (C2) cannot hold.

The offending ray of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ is the one represented by the entropy vector $v = (2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 5, 6)$. In the Supplementary Information of [20], it is shown to be achieved by means of the probability distribution

$$P_{\mathrm{XYZ}}(x, y, z) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{64}, & x \oplus y + x \oplus z + y \oplus z = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $x \in \{1, \ldots, 4\}$, $y, z \in \{1, \ldots, 8\}$ and $\oplus$ denotes addition modulo 2. This means that $P_{\mathrm{XYZ}}(x, y, z) = \frac{1}{64}$ if and only if either x, y and z are all odd or they are all even. This distribution can be mapped to the perfect correlations of (16) by locally mapping all odd outcomes to 1 and all even outcomes to 0 at X, Y and Z. Such correlations are known not to be achievable in $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ and hence this distribution is also not achievable in the triangle causal structure.

Appendix D: Proof of Proposition 27

In this section, we prove Proposition 27 using similar reasoning to that used in the proof of Proposition 26 in [67].

First, since all classical distributions can be realised using quantum systems, $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{Q}}\right)$. We now show that this inclusion is strict in the case where two nodes output two bits and one node outputs only one. To do so, we consider the setup in Figure 5 of Section III B 1, taking $Z = \mathrm{AND}(A, B)$, $\tilde{A} = A$, $\tilde{B} = B$ and $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{X}}\tilde{\mathrm{Y}}|\tilde{\mathrm{A}}\tilde{\mathrm{B}}}$ to violate the CHSH inequality. This yields an observed distribution of the form

$$P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}\tilde{\mathrm{B}}\tilde{\mathrm{X}}\tilde{\mathrm{Y}}\mathrm{Z}} = \frac{1}{4} P_{\tilde{\mathrm{X}}\tilde{\mathrm{Y}}|\tilde{\mathrm{A}}\tilde{\mathrm{B}}} \delta_{Z,\mathrm{AND}(\tilde{A},\tilde{B})}\,. \tag{D1}$$

[36] To see that the intersection is convex, consider two subsets A, $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{2^n-1}$. Let x, $y \in A \cap B$. Then, due to the convexity of A and B, every convex combination of x and y lies within A and within B. Thus, $A \cap B$ is convex.

[37] Note that a direct proof of convexity of $\overline{\Gamma^*}(C^C)$ may also be conducted analogously to the proof of Conjecture 1 in [25].

In a slight abuse of notation we refer to this as P_{XYZ}. We start with the following lemma in which we ignore $\tilde{X}$ and $\tilde{Y}$.

Lemma 33. *If $P_{\mathrm{XYZ}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$, then $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}|\mathrm{AC}} = P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}|\mathrm{A}}$ and $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{B}}|\mathrm{BC}} = P_{\tilde{\mathrm{B}}|\mathrm{B}}$.*

Proof. Due to the causal constraints we can write

$$P_{\mathrm{Z}\tilde{\mathrm{A}}\tilde{\mathrm{B}}} = \sum_{abc} P_{\mathrm{Z}|\mathrm{ab}} P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}|\mathrm{ac}} P_{\tilde{\mathrm{B}}|\mathrm{bc}} P_{\mathrm{A}}(a) P_{\mathrm{B}}(b) P_{\mathrm{C}}(c).$$

Because $Z = \mathrm{AND}(\tilde{A}, \tilde{B})$, we can derive the following two conditions:

1. Using $P_{\mathrm{Z}\tilde{\mathrm{A}}\tilde{\mathrm{B}}}(0,1,1) = 0$, it follows that for each triple (a,b,c) either $P_{\mathrm{Z}|\mathrm{ab}}(0) = 0$ or $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}|\mathrm{ac}}(1) = 0$ or $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{B}}|\mathrm{bc}}(1) = 0$.

2. Using $P_{\mathrm{Z}\tilde{\mathrm{A}}\tilde{\mathrm{B}}}(1,0,0) = P_{\mathrm{Z}\tilde{\mathrm{A}}\tilde{\mathrm{B}}}(1,0,1) = P_{\mathrm{Z}\tilde{\mathrm{A}}\tilde{\mathrm{B}}}(1,1,0) = 0$, it follows that for each triple (a,b,c) either $P_{\mathrm{Z}|\mathrm{ab}}(1) = 0$ or $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}|\mathrm{ac}}(1) = P_{\tilde{\mathrm{B}}|\mathrm{bc}}(1) = 1$.

We first argue that Z is a deterministic function of A and B, i.e., $P_{Z|ab} \in \{0,1\}$ for all pairs (a,b). From condition 2 we know that either $P_{\mathrm{Z}|\mathrm{ab}}(1) = 0$ (and thus $P_{\mathrm{Z}|\mathrm{ab}}(0) = 1$) deterministically, or that $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}|\mathrm{ac}}(1) = P_{\tilde{\mathrm{B}}|\mathrm{bc}}(1) = 1$. But in the latter case condition 1 implies that $P_{\mathrm{Z}|\mathrm{ab}}(0) = 0$ (and thus $P_{\mathrm{Z}|\mathrm{ab}}(1) = 1$).

Now let us consider the two cases (a) $P_{\mathrm{Z}|\mathrm{ab}}(1) = 1$; and (b) $P_{\mathrm{Z}|\mathrm{ab}}(1) = 0$ separately.

(a) Let (a,b) be such that $P_{\mathrm{Z}|\mathrm{ab}}(1) = 1$. According to condition 2, $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}|\mathrm{ac}}(1) = P_{\tilde{\mathrm{B}}|\mathrm{bc}}(1) = 1$ for all c, and thus we have $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}|\mathrm{ac}} = P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}|\mathrm{a}}$ as well as $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{B}}|\mathrm{bc}} = P_{\tilde{\mathrm{B}}|\mathrm{b}}$.

(b) Let (a,b) be such that $P_{\mathrm{Z}|\mathrm{ab}}(1) = 0$. Then $P_{\mathrm{Z}|\mathrm{ab}}(0) = 1$ and thus by condition 1 for all c either $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}|\mathrm{ac}}(1) = 0$ or $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{B}}|\mathrm{bc}}(1) = 0$. We further divide into two cases: either (i) (a,b) are such that $P_{\mathrm{Z}|\mathrm{ab}'}(1) = 0$ for all b' and $P_{\mathrm{Z}|\mathrm{a}'\mathrm{b}}(1) = 0$ for all a'; or (ii) they are not.

(ii) Suppose $\exists b'$ such that $P_{\mathrm{Z}|\mathrm{ab}'}(1) = 1$. In this case $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}|\mathrm{ac}}(1) = 1$ for all c due to condition 2 and thus from condition 1 we have $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{B}}|\mathrm{bc}}(1) = 0$. Thus for such pairs (a,b), the relations $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}|\mathrm{ac}} = P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}|\mathrm{a}}$ as well as $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{B}}|\mathrm{bc}} = P_{\tilde{\mathrm{B}}|\mathrm{b}}$ hold. Symmetric considerations can be made in the case where $\exists a'$ such that $P_{\mathrm{Z}|\mathrm{a}'\mathrm{b}}(1) = 1$ instead.

(i) It cannot be the case that all pairs (a,b) have $P_{\mathrm{Z}|\mathrm{ab}'}(1) = 0$ for all b' and $P_{\mathrm{Z}|\mathrm{a}'\mathrm{b}}(1) = 0$ for all a' (otherwise $P_Z(1) = 0$). Hence there exists (a'', b'') for which $P_{\mathrm{Z}|\mathrm{a}''\mathrm{b}''}(1) = 1$. By condition 2, this implies that $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}|\mathrm{a}''\mathrm{c}}(1) = P_{\tilde{\mathrm{B}}|\mathrm{b}''\mathrm{c}}(1) = 1$ for all c. Thus, as $P_{\mathrm{Z}|\mathrm{ab}''}(1) = 0$ and $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{B}}|\mathrm{b}''\mathrm{c}}(1) = 1$, it follows from condition 1 that $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}|\mathrm{ac}}(1) = 0$ for any c; $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{B}}|\mathrm{bc}}(1) = 0$ follows analogously, which concludes the proof. □

To prove the proposition, we will suppose that $P_{\mathrm{XYZ}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ and derive a contradiction.

First note that the previous lemma together with the form of C_3^{C} implies

$$P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}|\mathrm{C}} = P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}}, \text{ and } P_{\tilde{\mathrm{B}}|\mathrm{C}} = P_{\tilde{\mathrm{B}}}. \tag{D2}$$

Furthermore, from $P_{\mathrm{XYZ}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ we have

$$P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}\tilde{\mathrm{B}}\tilde{\mathrm{X}}\tilde{\mathrm{Y}}} = \sum_c P_{\mathrm{C}}(c) P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}|\mathrm{c}} P_{\tilde{\mathrm{B}}|\mathrm{c}} P_{\tilde{\mathrm{X}}\tilde{\mathrm{Y}}|\tilde{\mathrm{A}}\tilde{\mathrm{B}}\mathrm{c}}$$

which, using (D2), and the form of C_3^{C} can be rewritten

$$P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}\tilde{\mathrm{B}}\tilde{\mathrm{X}}\tilde{\mathrm{Y}}} = \sum_c P_{\mathrm{C}}(c) P_{\tilde{\mathrm{A}}} P_{\tilde{\mathrm{B}}} P_{\tilde{\mathrm{X}}|\tilde{\mathrm{B}}\mathrm{c}} P_{\tilde{\mathrm{Y}}|\tilde{\mathrm{A}}\mathrm{c}}.$$

However, that $P_{\tilde{\mathrm{X}}\tilde{\mathrm{Y}}|\tilde{\mathrm{A}}\tilde{\mathrm{B}}}$ violates a Bell inequality means that this equation cannot hold, establishing a contradiction. □

Appendix E: Additional calculations

Lemma 34. *One of the six equalities of (17) is redundant, i.e., any five of these constraints imply the sixth.*

Proof. Due to the symmetry of the constraints under permutations it is enough to show that each of the constraints $I(X:YZA|BC) = 0$ and $I(A:XBC) = 0$ is in turn implied by the five others. We first show that

$$\left.\begin{aligned} I(Y:XZB|AC) &= 0 \\ I(Z:XYC|AB) &= 0 \\ I(A:XBC) &= 0 \end{aligned}\right\} \implies I(X:YZA|BC) = 0.$$

To do so, note that

$$\begin{aligned} I(X:YZA|BC) =& I(X:A|BC) + I(X:Z|ABC) \\ &+ I(X:Y|ZABC), \end{aligned}$$

and consider the terms on the right. We have

$$0 = I(A:XBC) = I(A:BC) + I(A:X|BC),$$

which by positivity and symmetry of the mutual information implies $I(X:A|BC) = 0$. Likewise $I(Z:XYC|AB) = 0$ implies $I(X:Z|ABC) = 0$ and $I(Y:XZB|AC) = 0$ implies $I(X:Y|ZABC) = 0$.

The implication

$$\left.\begin{aligned} I(X:YZA|BC) &= 0 \\ I(B:YAC) &= 0 \\ I(C:ZAB) &= 0 \end{aligned}\right\} \implies I(A:XBC) = 0.$$

follows by an analogous argument. □

Appendix F: Further families of inequalities

Infinite families of inequalities may be derived to tighten the entropic approximation to $\Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$. Here

we give two more such families. There are, however, numerous other examples that can be derived in a similar way.

Lemma 35 is derived from (6) by combining the inequalities for one s-value at a time with the Shannon and conditional independence constraints. Other than Lemma 23, it is the only family derived from (6) in this way, for which none of the resulting inequalities are rendered redundant by those found in the calculations for Case 2 in Section III A 4.

Lemma 35. *All entropy vectors* $v \in \Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ *obey*

$$\begin{aligned}\left(-\frac{1}{2}s^2-\frac{3}{2}s-2\right)(H(X)+H(Y)+H(Z)-H(XY))\\ +\left(\frac{1}{2}s^2+\frac{3}{2}s+1\right)H(XZ)+(s+2)\,H(YZ)\\ +(-s-1)\,H(XYZ)\geq 0,\end{aligned}$$

for all $s \in \mathbb{N}$. *The same holds for all permutations of* X, Y *and* Z.

Lemma 36 is an example of a family of inequalities derived from (7).

Lemma 36. *All entropy vectors* $v \in \Gamma^*_{\mathcal{M}}\left(C_3^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$ *obey*

$$\begin{aligned}\left(-\frac{1}{2}s^2-\frac{3}{2}s-2\right)(H(X)+H(Z)-H(XY))\\ +(-2s-2)\,H(Y)+\left(s^2+2\right)H(XZ)\\ +\left(\frac{1}{2}s^2+\frac{3}{2}s+1\right)(H(YZ))+\left(-s^2-1\right)H(XYZ)\geq 0,\end{aligned}$$

for all $s \in \mathbb{N}$. *The same holds for all permutations of* X, Y *and* Z.

The proofs of both lemmas rely on performing a variable elimination (essentially doing Fourier-Motzkin elimination analytically). They are not particularly instructive and are omitted here.